1\textsuperscript{ST} NOTICE OF PREPARATION (AUGUST 2003)
August 5, 2003

Enclosed is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2004 Long Range Development Plan for the University of California, San Diego. The NOP describes the project and the environmental issues that will be investigated and discussed in the EIR. Response to the NOP is an opportunity for agencies, organizations, and individuals to assure that issues of concern are addressed and to comment on the proposed contents of the EIR. NOP comments are due by September 4, 2003.

Additionally, a “scoping meeting” will be held as an additional means of soliciting and receiving information during the NOP comment period. The UCSD scoping meeting will include the presentation of:

- Existing Long Range Development Plan
- Enrollment and Campus Population Projections
- Identification of Differences Between the Existing LRDP and the Proposed Updated LRDP
- Summary of Environmental Issues to be Included in LRDP EIR
- Background Information on Specific Environmental Issues
- Discussion of Environmental Impact Thresholds to be Used in Project Analysis
- Timetable for LRDP Preparation, Public Review, and Approval

The scoping meeting has been scheduled for Wednesday, August 27, 2003, at 6:00 p.m. on the UCSD campus in University Center Building 111A. We invite you to provide comments in writing or at the scoping meeting. Please address written comments as indicated in the attached NOP.

If you have any questions about the NOP, EIR, or LRDP, please contact me at 858-534-5782 or by e-mail at mphegley@ucsd.edu

Sincerely,

Milton J. Phegley, AICP
Campus Community Planner
August 1, 2003

Ms. Jan Hintzman, Director
Facilities Planning
San Diego City Schools
4100 Normal St., Annex 2, Rm. 101
San Diego, California 92103

NOTICE OF PREPARATION - DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Project Title: UCSD 2004 Long Range Development Plan

Project Number: 968146

Lead Agency: University of California

Project Location: University of California, San Diego

County: San Diego

Project Description: The University of California, San Diego proposes to update the campus' Long Range Development Plan, previously adopted by The Regents of the University of California in November 1989. The 2004 Long Range Development Plan ("2004 LRDP") will be undertaken to address anticipated growth in student enrollment and associated expansion of faculty, staff, academic and ancillary programs, and facilities.

The State of California Department of Finance and the California Public Postsecondary Education Commission anticipate substantial growth in the State of California over the next decade. The University proposes to accommodate this increase in order to meet the State's needs and sustain its commitment to ensure access to public higher education under the Master Plan for Higher Education in California. It is anticipated that UCSD could experience an increase in regular academic year student enrollment of approximately 6,800 by the year 2020. This potential increase would exceed the student enrollment assumptions in the adopted LRDP by 3,650 students. Accordingly, UCSD will update the LRDP and prepare an Environmental Impact Report in accordance with Section 21080.09 of the California Environmental Quality Act ("the LRDP EIR").
The University of California will be the Lead Agency and will prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to evaluate the environmental effects of growth under the 2004 LRDP. The 2004 LRDP EIR will be a Program EIR that will be used at a program-level in the environmental review of and subsequent tiering of project specific campus development through plan build out year 2020.

An Initial Study has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the CEQA Guidelines, and the University of California Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA to identify the potential environmental issues that will be addressed in the 2004 LRDP EIR. These issues include: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation and traffic, utilities and service systems. The initial study has determined that the 2004 LRDP would not have potential impacts on agricultural and mineral resources. The 2004 LRDP EIR will also include analysis of project alternatives and cumulative effects.

In compliance with the State and University of California guidelines for implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, this Notice of Preparation is hereby sent to inform you that the University of California, San Diego is preparing a Draft Environmental Impact Report on the above-named project. As Lead Agency we need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information, which is germane to your agency’s statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project.

We appreciate your prompt acknowledgement and review of this Initial Study. Due to the time limits mandated by state law, the 30-day comment period will extend from August 4, 2003 to September 4, 2003. Your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but not later than 5:00 PM on September 4, 2003. Please designate a contact person in your agency and send your response to:

Jeffrey A. Steindorf
Assistant Vice Chancellor Campus Planning
University of California, San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive, MC 0006
La Jolla, CA 92093-0006

A community information and EIR scoping meeting will be held at 6 p.m. Wednesday August 27, 2003 on the UCSD campus in Building 111A University Center. The scoping meeting will also be advertised in local newspapers and by direct mailing to notify interested individuals, organizations and associations. In addition, this NOP and attached Initial Study are available on the web at http://physicalplanning.ucsd.edu/LRDP2004/environ_review/env.html.
If you have any questions about the project please contact Catherine Presmyk, UCSD Assistant Director of Environmental Planning at (858) 534-3860.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

for Jeffrey A. Steindorf
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Campus Planning
Form A
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1ST SCOPING MEETING NOTICE
AND TRANSCRIPT
A "scoping meeting" is held by a public agency as part of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) preparation process. An initial step in the EIR process is the issuance of a "Notice of Preparation" (NOP) to Federal, State, and local agencies. Information about the NOP and the Scoping Meeting is being sent by UCSD to a wide range of potentially interested agencies, organizations, and individuals. (http://physicalplanning.ucsd.edu/LRDP2004/environ_review/env.html)

The NOP describes the project and the environmental issues which will be investigated and discussed in the EIR, together with background information and a summary of the method in which the issues will be addressed. Response to the NOP is an opportunity for agencies, organizations, and individuals to assure that issues of concern are addressed and to comment on the proposed contents of the EIR.

A "scoping meeting" is held as an additional means of soliciting and receiving information during the NOP comment period. The format for UCSD’s scoping meeting will include the presentation of:

- Existing Long Range Development Plan
- Enrollment and Campus Population Projections
- Identification of Differences Between the Existing LRDP and the Proposed Updated LRDP
- Summary of Environmental Issues to be Included in LRDP EIR
- Background Information on Specific Environmental Issues
- Discussion of Environmental Impact Thresholds to be Used in Project Analysis
- Timetable for LRDP Preparation, Public Review, and Approval.

UCSD staff and the campus’ environmental consultant will be present at the scoping meeting. Public comments will be received at the meeting either in writing (http://physicalplanning.ucsd.edu/LRDP2004/environ_review/NOPCommentForm.pdf) or oral testimony. Brief, clarifying answers or information may be provided at the meeting. Substantive responses to questions or comments will not provided at the meeting, but will be incorporated into the environmental review process.
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MR. PHEGLEY: Good evening. This will begin the Environmental Impact Report Scoping Meeting for UCSD's Long-Range Development Plan. My name is Milt Phegley. I'm the Campus Community Planner here at UCSD, and I will be sort of the master of ceremonies of this evening's proceedings. I want to welcome you to this meeting and encourage you to ask questions and provide comments during this process.

The purpose of this evening's meeting is to provide information about the UCSD Long-Range Development Plan and the accompanying Environmental Impact Report, and more importantly, about the process that we will be following as we develop the Long-Range Development Plan and the EIR.

This evening's meeting will be tape recorded and a transcript will be prepared so that any relevant information that's presented at this meeting and comments will be incorporated into the record for the Environmental Impact Report. We will not be discussing individual projects in any detail this evening, but rather, using this as an opportunity to provide an overview of the UCSD land use planning process and the environmental review process.

As we progress through the planning and environmental review process over the next year, there will be a
number of opportunities for public involvement and a number
of opportunities for information for you and other members
of the community about UCSD's plans for the future. We want
to encourage you to participate, and if you have questions
or comments, or a group of your neighbors have questions or
comments, or you belong to a group or organization that you
think would benefit from hearing any information about
UCSD's Long-Range Development Plan, we would invite you to
let us know, and we we'll be happy to try to facilitate that
process.

We do have a sign-up sheet by the door, which, if
you've not signed, I would encourage you to sign it before
you leave. This will give us information to be able to
maintain contact with you through this process, either in
writing or by e-mail. And we also over by the door there
have comment sheets that you can fill out this evening and
leave, or take with you and return by September 4th to
provide comments about the scope and the issues of the
proposed EIR.

A number of UCSD staff and our consultant will be
participating in the presentation this evening. I'd like to
just briefly introduce them to you. You'll be seeing each
of them later in this presentation. First is Cathy Presmyk,
who is our Senior Environmental Planner; Lance Schulte at
the end, who is Senior Planner in our Physical Planning
Office; and then Kim Howlett, who is the Environmental Services Manager for PBS&J, who are our prime consultants on the Environmental Impact Report.

Before we begin the presentation, I just want to call your attention to the web address that’s on the screen. It’s contained in a number of the handout materials that you have. So you don't need to try to write all of this down right now. It's in the handout materials. Also I might point out that on the table, if you didn't pick one up, is a handout which contains all of the slides in this evening's presentation. So when it comes to seeing facts and figures or numbers or something on the screen, you can just follow along on the handout. This website is the primary website for the Long-Range Development Plan and EIR process. All of the documents will be accessible here. When we move to the public review phase of the Environmental Impact Report next spring, you also will be able to provide comments on the EIR through this website. So this is a one-stop location for any information that you need about the LRDP and EIR.

I want to go briefly through the agenda that we're going to be following this evening, and then we'll get started with the presentation. We're going to provide some information about the LRDP process in terms of what documents are going to be produced and when they will be
available for public review. Lance is going to talk about what the Long-Range Development Plan is and why it's necessary that we update the current plan. We'll talk briefly about the existing Long-Range Development Plan and what the population and physical development that's envisioned in it is. Then we'll discuss what the components of the 2004 Long-Range Development Plan are. Kim will address the environmental issues that we intend to address as part of the EIR process. I'll then provide a summary of those processes and issues, and then we will move on to public comments.

So with that, I would like to turn this over to Cathy Presmyk, who will talk about our EIR and LRDP process.

MS. PRESMYK: Thank you, Milt. I appreciate the introduction.

UCSD has prepared a Draft Long-Range Development Plan that is intended to replace and supersede the 1989 plan that we've been using for years. Under the California Environmental Equality Act, or also known as "CEQA" in my circles, C-E-Q-A -- and you'll see that quite often for the next year -- all proposed projects that may have an effect on the environment are required to undergo analysis pursuant to state CEQA law. A key component of CEQA is the public input component of this process. As you can see on the slide behind me, in the yellow circles there are three
opportunities for input during this process for you and the community. I'm going to talk briefly on how this is going to work so you have a better understanding of what to expect.

UCSD prepared an environmental evaluation to basically begin to assess what issues we thought might be important to look at as we went down this process. We determined that an Environmental Impact Report would be the most appropriate document to prepare based on implementation of the plan as prepared. Pursuant to state CEQA law, we filed an NOP, Notice of Preparation, which is in the top yellow circle on the slide behind me. This is basically a notice that is distributed to the State of California, as well as broad notice sent to mail lists that we have at the campus. Federal agencies, local agencies, local community groups and interested neighbors have all been noticed that this process is going forward. The intent of this notice is basically to get people to think about what's important to them and provide input to us so that we can make informed decisions about what should go in the EIR. The NOP period ends on the 4th of September, and the comments that we receive tonight from you and also in writing based on the notice that has gone out, will be used to inform the content of the document that we will then begin to prepare this fall and through the winter.
The next opportunity for public input is in the early part of next year. We would plan to have the Draft EIR that we've prepared based on the comment we get now available, and then would be circulated for the public to look at again. At that time, you would have another opportunity to provide comments to us, and the comments we receive at that time would be responded to in writing. They may also inform the content of the LRDP, depending on what the comments are, and therefore there's another opportunity to provide input and have responses made that would influence the content of both the EIR and the LRDP.

These comments, at their conclusion, then form what we call the final environmental document. Once this documentation is final sometime next summer, we hope, there would then be a third opportunity for public input. This would be when the project goes to the UC Board of Regents and they hold a public hearing on the project.

So as you can see, there are numerous opportunities to be involved and to provide your input. Obviously, we're encouraging input early, because that helps us do a better job doing the analysis from the front end. And we are at the front end of our process now.

So with that, I'd like to introduce Lance Schulte. Lance is going to tell you a little bit more about our LRDP.
MR. SCHULTE: Thanks, Cathy.

So just to kind of let you know what a Long-Range Development Plan is, it's basically a general land use plan that outlines -- and you can see a sample of the diagram over there on the board -- that outlines various locations for land uses within the campus. It also, critically, is a capacity analysis. It identifies how much capacity is available within those different land uses.

The LRDP is also a guide for physical development of the campus. It's the campus document that's used for evaluating different growth or developments or different programs that happen on campus from a physical standpoint. It's also a broad and adaptable policy framework that allows the university to address its growth over the time frames of the plan. In this plan that we're talking about, the 2004, it's almost a 20-year time horizon, or a 17-year time horizon. So it's in a framework for kind of evaluating all the different things that would happen to the campus and around the campus in the next 17 years. So it has flexibility to try to address a lot of those contingencies.

Lastly, it also provides information not only to the campus and to the University of California Regents, but also the community regarding land use on campus, and sort of where we think we're going to go in the next 17 years. But what isn't in the LRPD, it's not really a detailed plan for
development. It doesn't list out specific sites for buildings, or even specific buildings. It doesn't do that at all. It deals with capacities. It's not a commitment to specific projects or particular programs, because it's that broad framework that we talked about. Nor does it indicate construction schedules or funding priorities, or even assurances that even some of the development that the plan projects will even be built.

Why is it necessary that we go through this process of creating this long-range plan for the next 17 years? Well, the last plan was completed in 1989, and that was -- what? -- about 14, 15 years ago. A lot's changed since then. That plan had a horizon year, or it looked at the future of the campus to the year 2005 or 2006, which is only two to three years away. So that plan made, you know, 14, 15 years ago was looking at almost to where we're at today.

We're doing the plan also to provide an update of current information regarding population and enrollments. As you all know, the State of California's grown. The University of California and UCSD have a role in educating our future citizens. With that population growth, we've had new enrollment projects that have come to the campus, and we have to incorporate those. Our '89 plan could only look so far into the future, and now we have to kind of step back
and look far into the future again.

Lastly, the plan is also bringing up updated environmental information, not only for the current situation that we're in now, but also trying to project that out, again, for that 17 years. A lot of things have changed since '89. A lot of things will change by the time it's 2020, 2021.

The existing 1989 Long-Range Development Plan was adopted and is adopted by the University of California Board of Regents. It provides a land use plan and guidance for the physical development of the campus, and also outlines basically what the campus population would be, or estimates or projects (sic) of what that would be.

This is a slide -- basically an equivalent slide of the '89 LRDP, our current Long-Range Development Plan. That colored exhibit near the wall is the proposed Draft 2004 LRDP. If you were to look at them and kind of compare them side-to-side, you'd see a lot of the boundaries are pretty consistent with things. There hasn't been a lot of changes to the boundaries of land uses and the land use categories.

The existing LRDP that we're currently operating under projected in 1989 that we would have about 16 million gross square feet on campus in about 2005/2006. Right now, we have about 10 million gross square feet. So we've not --
the campus has not grown as anticipated. That's one key consideration you have to understand with the LRDP. It's not a specific roadmap that says, by X-amount of years, or by 19- -- or by the year 2005/2006, we will have 16 million. It says, by that time, we project that we may be at 16 million, and that's where we may be, but it's not a requirement that that be reached. It's a capacity. It says that that's our capacity, and we can always develop under that capacity.

Also in the '89 LRDP had population projections for campus. As you can see, the 2005/2006 LRDP projections projected about 42,000 people on campus -- students, faculty, researchers and staff. Well, our actual population as we sit now just two or three years away is 32,000 -- about 32,000. So again, our campus population has not reached the point of what our '89 LRDP anticipated or projected.

So that kind of summarizes what the '89 plan is and the basic kind of statistical numbers of that. I'll start to present now the 2004 draft plan.

It, like the '89 plan, projects out a campus population. It incorporates some planning factors in taking those population projections to mold them into a plan that eventually creates a land use plan. And I'll go through each one of these individually.
As I mentioned, the enrollments for California higher education come from the State of California. The State of California is projecting that there will be about 700,000 new college students by the year 2010. These are new citizens that are going to, you know, help grow our state and drive our economy. It's estimated, of those 700,000 college students that we -- new college students that we anticipate having in 2010, about 200,000 of them will be University of California students. The University of California has a commitment under its California Master Plan of Higher Education to guarantee a University of California education to the top 12 percent of the high school students in the State of California. So the very best and brightest are guaranteed an opportunity of a UC education, and this is our share of that growth.

Secondly, or lastly, the enrollments -- these enrollment increases obviously filter down to the University of Cal- -- UCSD. So here's the projections that we have in the Long-Range Development Plan. These projections are showing the changes from our current situation, which is about 32,000 of a campus population, to about an estimate or a projection of almost 49,000 about 17 years from now. Again, this is a projection. This is not a guaranteed endpoint that we will reach, but it is a capacity that we project.
This capacity, then, gets modified by a variety of different planning factors that affect us. First is our academic and non-academic program requirements that we have on campus and that we are charged with the from the University of California. There's a distribution of the different student enrollments across the various academic programs on campus. There's an optimal rate of student-to-faculty growth to basically bring -- allow or have capacity of students to come on when we have facilities available for them, and at the proper ratios for the quality of education that's provided, and, again, an appropriate ratio of graduate students to undergraduate students, given the extensive research role that the university plays and the role and interaction between graduate and undergraduate students. Those key factors shape the major academic mission of the university.

There are other planning factors that help shape this mission as far as the campus site and the surrounding environment. They're UCSD's unique characteristics in light of the long history that we've had here and the culture that we've established, the environmental resources that we have on campus -- the grove, the open spaces that you're all fairly aware of -- and the need to bring services to handle the student growth in population, with housing -- student housing, parking for students, transportation improvements,
recreational improvements and such.

We also have planning factors that have been incorporated into the plan to deal with the sensitivity to our unique location here in La Jolla. Those are the opinions of campus consigency (ph) groups and community stakeholders like yourself. You're a part of this process, and that's why we're very happy to have you here to hear your input, and also to heed the needs and interests of the surrounding community, the city, the state and the nation, because UCSD is -- in some ways, it's a local institution, but it's also a national and international one in the stature and the quality of the institution.

So here's a big blow-up of the same map that's over on the side. What this is is the land use plan that kind of identifies the various locations of land use on the campus. Probably the most noticeable feature that pops up in my mind on this is the large swath of green, which is our UCSD park, which is our kind of permanent open space area through campus, which includes our natural lands and also our grove. We can go and look at that in more detail. But this is the -- kind of the crystallization of the plan in showing kind of where land uses would generally occur and what type of land uses.

This exhibit portrays the current building footprints, or kind of basically where buildings are on
campus right now. This represents the 10 million square feet of development we have on campus. Now, this exhibit may be a little bit stylized, and so hopefully you won't look too closely at it.

Now, this is a conceptual representation of potentially the development of 19 million gross square feet that could potentially occur in the year 2020 based on the land use plan. Again, this is a conceptual representation. You shouldn't -- it's done for illustrative purposes. It doesn't mean there's going to be a building in that location, nor does it mean it's going to look like that. But it gives you an idea -- a general idea of how growth could occur over the next 17 years.

With that, I'm going to be passing this on to Kim Howlett. One of the things that I think Milt mentioned earlier was that, as campus development occurs, both at the LRDP level, the conceptual level, the capacity level that we're talking about tonight, and in the form of individual projects, both, you know, buildings and ball fields and other sorts of improvements, UCSD will provide public review and relevant environmental information as we go through and those projects come forward.

So with that, I'd like to introduce Kim.

MR. HOWLETT: Thanks, Lance.

I wanted to start off with a couple of thoughts
about the CEQA review. The first is that the California Environmental Quality Act requires fair and balanced information for decision-makers. In this case, that information will be incorporated into the Environmental Impact Report. The second item is that the Long-Range Development Plan/EIR will be what we call a program EIR, which can be used for tiering of the CEQA review of future individual projects. And by "tiering," we mean the use of the Long-Range Development Program EIR as a base of information for review of specific development projects in the future.

I want to talk just a moment about our team. As you know, I'm from PBS&J. We're the lead consultants in preparing the Environmental Impact Report. But we also have a team of experts to provide the depth and breadth of knowledge to address the various issues associated with this EIR. They're just listed here on this slide.

The next thing I wanted to talk about was the EIR preparation tasks. Some of these you've already heard about from Cathy. But the process has begun with the preparation of an initial study, which Cathy mentioned has already been done, and the EIR Notice of Preparation has already been done, which is out for public review now, soliciting input from agencies and members of the public with respect to what they'd like to see addressed in this Environmental Impact
We have begun the preparation of the EIR now. It's in the beginning stages. We are going to be assessing impacts and developing mitigation measures to be considered. After we complete the Draft EIR, it will be circulated for public review, where again we'll be looking for comments -- written comments -- from agencies and from the public, including organizations and individuals. After we receive those comments, we then prepare responses in writing to those comments, and they become part of the final impact report.

Now, in addition to the final EIR, the CEQA process also requires the preparation of a Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program, also known as an "MMRP." That document provides the mechanism to ensure that mitigation measures identified in the EIR are actually implemented on the ground.

In this slide, we're showing the 14 issue categories or topics that we intend to address in the EIR. You can see it ranges from aesthetics to traffic and transportation. Also the EIR will be addressing project alternatives and cumulative impacts.

There's a couple of issues that we think are going to be especially important for the campus's ability to achieve the goals of the LRDP. These are housing and
transportation. These will be evaluated in greater detail than ever before.

With that, I think I'll turn it back over to Milt.

MR. PHEGLEY: Thank you, Cathy and Lance and Kim.

Again, I want to emphasize what process we have here and where we are in the process now. We're at this first step in terms of the Notice of Preparation and the scoping meeting. So it's important at this point that you have an opportunity to provide input on issues that you want to see addressed in the EIR, issues -- or -- or if you have certain ways in which you want to see issues addressed, or to identify the importance of one issue over another. As I said, we do have comment forms available. Any written comments that you provide to us by September 4th will be included in the Notice of Preparation.

We also have the opportunity this evening for you to provide any oral comments that you wish to. As I said, we are having the tape recorded and transcribed. So it's equally effective in terms of whether you provide a written comment or an oral comment.

I wanted to say one thing about comments, especially oral comments that are provided this evening. And that is that we would prefer to hear your questions and your comments. I don't think we're going to have the
ability this evening to engage in a lot of detailed response
to any questions or comments that you have, although we
certainly will try to provide some short answers to some
basic questions, if that's necessary.

Also, if you do have comments, either oral or
written, it's preferable that they be sort of on point in
terms of a specific issue or a specific area of concern
rather than a comment such as, "I'm concerned about all the
growth that's occurring." That's not something that's going
to be very easy -- you know, easily respondable to. So what
would be a preferable comment would be something about, you
know, "I'm concerned about the amount of traffic that may
be -- that may result in single-family neighborhoods as a
result of the university's growth." That's something that
we can respond in detail to, say, you know, here's what the
anticipated traffic is. If it's something that is
identified as being a significant issue, then it's something
that there can be mitigation measures proposed for.

So with that, I'd like to invite anyone who has
comments to make to come forward. All you need to do is
state your name and make your brief statement. We do not
have speaker slips. It's first-come-first-serve. We trust
that, because you've signed the sign-in sheet, that we'll
get your name correctly spelled and all those sorts of
things.
So with that, anyone who would like to provide any comments is welcome to come forward.

MR. KEN KING: Well, I'll start it out. Hello, Mr. Phegley. My name is Ken King. I'm a very nearby resident of the university, and I'm on the Board of Trustees of the La Jolla Town Council and the San Diego County Bicycle Coalition. So I'm thrilled to see that you recognize one of the key issues is traffic and transportation, because a lot more density can be tolerated if there are good alternative transportation measures.

I believe the university has a committee on the bicycles because there is such a large contingency of students and faculty in my neighborhood that does ride bicycles. So I would encourage you to engage the San Diego County Bicycle Coalition in any input that you need with respect to what would work for cyclists and bicycling facilities.

Thanks.

MR. PHEGLELY: Thank you. Next.

MR. JOE GUSFIELD: I'm Joe Gusfield, a member of the Board of Directors of the La Jolla Shores Association and a member of the La Jolla Shores -- of the La Jolla Traffic and Transportation Committee.

I'm concerned on what you talk about with trying to understand if we can by next year have a good sense of
what kind of public transportation is planned. I hear all sorts of rumors and stories about present plans for public transportation. But the issue of traffic will depend heavily upon what kind of public transportation will be available, what kind of pub- -- and where, so that I would see this as a very important issue.

MS. SHERRI LIGHTNER: My name is Sherri Lightner, and I had a question regarding one of the slides that was presented, which did a comparison between the 2002/03 population for the university and what was originally projected. Do you know why it did not achieve the projections, and are you taking this into account with your projections for 2020? Is there any possibility the projections will be -- I mean, the actual population will be greater than the projections, and how do you assess that? That's to be -- not right here.

MR. PHEGLEY: Anyone else?

MS. PAMELA MAHER: Yeah. My name is Pamela Maher. I'm on the Board of Scripps Estates Associates, which is one of the neighborhoods that's in this area. In particular, we're concerned about this new plan where, for the first time, you have university buildings directly coming up against a residential area. This would be new for UCSD, because previously the buildings haven't been directly next to residential areas. With this new plan, since it is
going to be directly -- you have plans to directly build
next to a residential area, the mitigation on the impact of
those buildings on the residential area becomes a lot more
important in how you're going to -- I'm concerned about how
that's going to be addressed, and particularly what kind of
input the neighborhood would have to any kind of buildings
that are built right next to it.

MS. RUTH STRITCH: Hi. I'm Ruth Stritch. I have
questions. I really appreciate you have the two important
things highlighted, the housing and the transportation. My
question is this: What proportion of students are currently
housed on campus, and how many do you expect to house out of
the proposed 29,000 by the time you have all the buildings
up?

MR. PHEGLEY: Go ahead.

MS. JOANN BENEDICT: My name is Joann Benedict.
I would like to ask if there is any information available at
this point on the many, many eucalyptus trees in the grove
along Azul and the end of Poole Street that have been marked
with the very large white dots. Nothing has come forth at
this point, even though there have been questions submitted
in writing, as I understand.

MS. SUSAN GOULIAN: I'm Susan Goulian. I'm Chair
of the La Jolla Shores Association. In a follow-up of Ruth
Stritch's question, of the students who do not live on
campus -- because I know there won't be enough dorms for them all -- do you have any plans for them in the area?

And then also, in relation to Scripps Institute of Oceanography, which is really nestled around a residential community, would the university consider taking on more responsibility for traffic control, traffic lights, also with the corner of La Jolla Village Drive, perhaps a bridge going over it? I don't mean to give specific suggestions, but that, again, is a very difficult pedestrian crossing, and it's impacted by the increase in the population.

MS. MARJORIE JACKSON: I noticed in the later slides tremendous shrinkage of the green area, and would like to indicate my concern. One of the beauties of the campus are our groves. I hope you're not going to lose them all.

MR. DAVE SCHUBERT: I'm Dave Schubert, a local resident adjacent to one of your pieces of land. As you people are quite aware, the University of California here in San Diego is exempt from a lot of regulations as far as building, traffic control, that type of thing, in the context of the city. I'm not so sure about the Coastal Commission and that type of situation. But the question is, you very carefully avoided stating, from my interpretation of your presentation, which official agencies are going to
have to go -- you're going to have to go through in order to get this plan carried out. It seemed from your presentation that the final body to make this decision is the Board of Regents, which I don't think is an appropriate, you know, entity to do this. And so the question, which I'd assume you could answer tonight, would be, which local, you know, bodies do you have to go through? Do you have to go through the city? Do you have to go through some of the State Planning and Coastal Commission, this type of thing? And nobody's answered any questions, but I think this is something you could deal with directly tonight.

MR. RAY WEISS: My name is Ray Weiss. I have two hats here, because I'm a UCSD professor at Scripps, but I'm also a trustee of the town council. I have a concern about the future of parking at UCSD. When I came to what was then UCLJ as a graduate student at Scripps, parking was six dollars a year for employees. Now it's over a thousand dollars a year. And there's less parking where I work than there was when it was six dollars a year. Parking is supposed to be self-supporting, according to the university system. But the going rate is actually about as high as it is in downtown La Jolla in the office buildings, and that's the average.

So I have a concern on the impact on the surrounding neighborhoods that comes from the parking
pressures of this economy. Where I live near downtown La Jolla, we're about to go to war with the local businesses because all the people who work there park in front of my house. I expect the people who live very close to where I work feel exactly the same way about the university, and I think that's bad. There are aspects of the town planning documents that require businesses to provide parking for the people who work in those businesses, and the university does that, too. But it does it at a rather high going rate. I think maybe we should change that balance in order to have a better balance with the community.

Thank you.

MS. SUE MOORE: Sue Moore. I have two concerns. One relates quite specifically to the issue of the July 2004 meeting. There have been recent projects in the La Jolla community that have been heard only in July and August, when most of the community is on vacation or sabbatical or traveling. I think that maybe the selection of another month than July for a La Jolla/UCSD project might be a little bit more helpful for this community.

The second one concerns population. To what extent will the increase in students, faculty and staff impinge upon the already at complete capacity and over capacity of every single public school in University City and La Jolla? Every school is now completely over capacity.
There is no building space in this community at all for any new schools, and none are planned. I hope that the UCSD Long-Range Development Plan will be specific enough to consider the issues of K through 12 education, because they're critical for an educational institution.

Thank you.

MS. PENELlope BOuRK: My name's Penelope Bourk, and I live near UCSD. I have several issues. I've written them up, and I'll hand them in, but I'll bring them up.

First, we read on page 9 that UCSD desires a positive, productive, responsive relationship with area residents. What we really want to know is, who's going to do the responding? We're hoping that the university is going to be the responsive organization.

Area residents and concerns -- area resident issues and concerns include university-affiliated encroachment, activities and facilities into adjacent single-family residential zoned neighborhoods. And if you have a question about that, please ask the specifics about that.

We have heard rumors of a future redevelopment area in the single-family residential area to the south of the university, south of La Jolla Village Drive, the possibility of declaring eminent domain, the possibility of it being turned into a redevelopment district, as happened at SDSU.
We've read the University Community Plan, and in the University Community Plan there seems to be quite a clear directive that university-affiliated activities for students that are not allowed on campus should be happening in the urban nodes at La Jolla Village Square and University Town Center. I wonder if you could tell me if any such facilities that currently exist? Right now in our neighborhood there is a -- a home has been taken over for offices and for advertised conference use for a university-affiliated group. We're very concerned about the precedent this sets for the single-family neighborhood. What the neighbors would ask is for the university to make provision for the sorts of affiliated groups that universities habitually attract. UCSD is not the only university in California. So you do have some basis to figure out what groups are going to be attracted, and which groups are going to need what. And if your own legal interpretation does not allow for certain university activities to happen on campus, the community really expects you to take care of that problem.

We have engaged in now three years and over $100,000 of battle to try and preserve the residential character of a neighborhood. And if you want a positive, productive, responsive relationship with residents, then you need to take care of your students.
We're concerned about the community -- the city-owned properties at 675. Now, you don't note it on your map, but your maps all indent to show where it is. Do you know where it is? It is contiguous with the university north of La Jolla Village Drive just south of the Theater District. It is a city-owned public open space which is specifically designated for institutional use. Now, if there are activities that cannot happen on campus because of UCSD legal interpretations, then that sort of site, which is completely contiguous to the campus, and available, and decided by the city to be institutional, would be a cute place for those activities, rather than in the residential neighborhood, where the pressure is now being exerted. If you don't know where Site 675 is, we would be glad to tell you about it. Milt knows.

The hotel conference center. I'm concerned about -- what does it mean on page 30 when it says that the planned hotel conference center is primarily for non-university use? Will it be used as a center for university-related conferences or campus business visitors, for instance? You know, if that is not a university-related use, I'd sort of be surprised. And so I'm wondering why it's not being considered in the Long-Range Plan itself as part. One of the problems we have in San Diego is that projects come up separately, and there is no collective
evaluation of the cumulative effect. We, knowing that now, hope that you will take that into account.

The campus population figures. It's a little bit hard, as I read the Long-Range Development Plan, to see exactly how the figures come together. For instance, on page 24 you mention that 350,000 people per year come to the Birch Aquarium. On page 45 you say a number of other people on campus arrive, as well as the students, staff and faculty. Now, I was led to believe that it's possibly, you know, up to tens of thousands of people actually are on campus on a daily basis as visitors. So, I mean, I think I -- I heard a figure -- I don't know whether it's daily or yearly -- of something like a projected figure of 59,000 people. That's quite a number. Some towns aren't that big. And that's just your visitors.

So what I'm asking is that, as you look at the campus population figures, you provide some kind of collective so that the community looking at it can actually see what the real collective numbers are. You know, the head count for students summer and fall and all that, that's cool. But there's an awful lot of other stuff happening on this campus, including the industrial development sent.

We've been ambushed. That doesn't need to happen if we get the information before pressures impact us. So we'd really appreciate that.
The housing figures are a real concern for us. We cannot imagine that the housing impacts are not going to push outside the campus. And again, that is why we're concerned about the city somehow declaring our area a redevelopment area. A lot of your faculty and staff lives there. It's a very important proximal area to the university. We want a written commitment in this Long-Range Development Plan that you do not intend as a university to take over that area for your own development, when in the University Community Plan it was very clearly set out that university expansions needs would go into the University Community Plan area, not the La Jolla Community Plan area. So we hope that you're looking at that.

Finally, I just -- you know, we're looking at expansion, and clearly your facilities are going to be impacted by these incredible expansions. But currently, as people walk around the campus, we notice things like, say, the naditorium that's rarely used. Down the street, a huge "Y" is going in with a naditorium. And it does occur to residents as they look at the incredible impacts whether there might be some campus facilities that during their off-peak hours could encourage community participation, for instance, on a per-use basis. I've been at other universities where, for instance, you can buy a pass for ten dips in the pool for $30, and you do that. You don't have
to pay some immense, long-term recreational fee.

My last question is really about attending these meetings. Some of us go to a lot of meetings in the community. What I need to know is, if a person comes to a meeting like this and makes their points, do they have to come to every single meeting to know that those points will be addressed, or can they come to one and know that you've listened and that you're going to respond? I mean, we have been to many meetings recently where all questions are considered rhetorical. None of the questions people are asking here tonight are considered rhetorical. So we're expecting an answer. Will we be disappointed? So anyway --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: I don't think they can write. I'm serious. No correspondence is ever considered.

MS. BOURK: Well, I mean, and if that's the perception of the community, that's really important for you to know. Because if you want a productive process with the community, we have to feel that we're linked. And some of us have certainly sent things on to Milt. We don't know whether there's just a giant shredder in his office, or whether the stuff goes any further. You know, Milt has one of those faces where you're not quite sure, you know. He holds a lot, and he tries hard to be the bridge to the community. But, you know, is he just the guardian at the
gate? We don't know. So we're hoping that you will be responsive to community needs. I'd like to offer the written part of this as my equivalent of that form and pass it in now.

My last question is, can I expect an answer in any way to these questions? What are we to expect who come to the meetings?

MR. PHEGLEY: The written comments that you're providing or the oral comments that you're providing in this process are going to be documented in the environmental document. So your expectation should be that your comments are somehow addressed in the environmental document. If they're not, then when it comes time to review the Draft Environmental Impact Report or something prior to that, and you see that your comments have not been addressed, there's another opportunity to say, you know, what about what I said?

Also, in terms of the questions and issues that are being raised here, on a number of issues I hope that we don't wait until next spring to respond to you on those issues. There's issues, both specific and process-related issues, that it's very valuable to hear these comments this evening, because then we can identify changes that need to be made to processes or things that need to be done to improve the communications.
MS. BOURK: The one other thing -- I looked at your pedestrian access diagram. As Susan Goulian mentioned, one of the missed areas is the corner at Torrey Pines across La Jolla Village Drive. You realize that it's now a nine-lane crossing. And while the EIR dealing with the widening of La Jolla Village Drive has attempted to deal with the issue by putting a red arrow there, unless the police are at the corner, people in that crosswalk are still endangered. I can't tell you the number of times people have been -- if the people aren't hit, the people waiting in line -- the cars waiting in line are rear-ended by the guy who didn't feel like stopping for the red arrow. And now what's difficult is pedestrians are under the illusion that they're even more protected, whereas, in fact, they seem to be even less protected. There's only one turning lane. The traffic backs up. The pressure is on the drivers to turn. You know, they've got their cell phones -- are there two now? Well, I thought maybe they got rid of one -- okay -- which makes it even worse, because then if there's an SUV in the close lane, and they're turning on the red light, they can't even see the pedestrian in the crosswalk.

So while you look at Expedition Way as an important gateway -- I mean, incredible numbers of people park all the way down La Jolla Scenic North -- you've probably noticed them -- all the way down Torrey Pines.
Many staff and faculty come. People park through the neighborhood on a two-hour basis. There's an incredible use of that corner, and it is incredibly unsafe. So we really hope that you will add it to the corners that you're going to look at, because it's really of concern.

MS. PAT GRANGER: My name is Pat Granger, and I live in the adjacent neighborhood on Robin Hood Lane.

Just to add to what Penny said, I spoke to a bus driver who made a right on the red at that very intersection, and he just shrugged. So that was a city bus that made a right on red.

I also would like to emphasize the concern the adjacent neighborhood feels for the possible encroachment by the university or university affiliation communities into our neighborhood. I'm really concerned about that -- everyone is -- especially after what happened at San Diego State University.

I will bring some other notes over, which Mr. Madaffer (ph) said about how they managed to get the large fraternity area and student accommodation in what was originally a residential neighborhood. We're concerned that that will happen in our neighborhood.

We also -- I wanted to also talk about 675, that if you could be diplomats and maybe exchange that site for one on the edge of campus somewhere, a lot of problems could
be solved with that 675 -- 653. So I'd like you to think about that.

Thank you very much.

MR. PHEGLEY: Anyone else have any additional comments?

MR. JERRY ANDERSON: Hi. My name is Jerry Anderson. I'm a resident of La Jolla. I'm also a trustee on the La Jolla Town Council.

Several things. I have one concern -- the idea about the natatorium I think is a good idea for the local community because I'm a swimmer and I try to use Canyon View Pool. But it's almost impossible to do that because there's not adequate parking, plus the cost of the parking pass kind of negates the whole idea because it's so expensive. So I was just not able to use the facility. So I think one idea is to make the facilities available.

But that highlights another issue, and that is, if you're going from 32,000 to 49,000, almost a 50 percent increase in population, you're going to have to increase the capacity for parking. I think it's extremely inadequate currently. So I would like to see what you have planned for adequate parking.

The other issue is, I don't see how we can possibly have a plan for a population of 49,000 folks as an island. This is La Jolla. So if we're now going to have a
49,000 city inside of La Jolla, I think the plan needs to incorporate the ancillary neighborhoods and the community of La Jolla -- not only the communities of residential, but also the business communities. So that would entail some sort of plan of impact surrounding it. So I would like to see incorporated in this plan, if it's going from 32- to 49,000, what ancillary services, what ancillary business services, and what other services that are required of the students that can't be housed on campus need to be housed within a certain parameter or certain distance of the campus, and how that's going to impact the surrounding area. So I don't see how we could possibly have a plan like this without a plan for the surrounding communities, and here's how this is going to be impacted when we're talking about 17,000 people increase in population.

MR. PHEGLEY: Any additional comments?

MS. BRENDAL ALPINERI: I'm Brenda Alpineri, and I live directly across the way from the aquarium on Prestwick Court. We're very disturbed about the land use that's planned for the area in Sea Weed Canyon (ph). Nobody's mentioned that. Because what's going in there is a machine shop supposedly, which is going to be taking in major company contracts, which would require drilling and sawing and all sorts of big operations, such as jobs from NASA and others, which our architectural committee has pointed out to
you. I'm just wondering, how did it get to the point where Coastal Commission decided that that was an okay thing to do in a canyon that everything is audible?

I can hear people in the parking lot across the way for the aquarium. I can hear them talking. I can hear what they're saying. That's what's kind of a audial (sic) disruption it is to the neighbors. And every now and then, we hear these sirens go off. People insist on parking their cars with their sirens, and somebody jars the car, and that goes on for long periods of time. It seems to me that the University at least could've made as a rule, don't put your parking sirens on when we have a guard here at the gate. Nobody's going to take your car.

This is just an example of how close our neighborhood is to the university. Putting in a machine shop right within the audial and the fire danger seems to us a very wrong use of land.

Thank you.

MR. PHEGLEY: Thank you.

Any additional comments, questions?

MS. BOURK: I just want to make sure that -- you know, we're talking about sort of generalities here. I just want to make sure that if you have any questions about 675 or the impingement into our neighborhood, that Milt will fill you in with documentation that he has.
The other concern is that there are certain auxiliary facilities that are being used by other universities as recruitment devices for students. And you're looking for an ethnically diverse campus. The -- again, Milt's aware of this issue -- how auxiliary student-affiliated institutions can affect whether or not students come to the campus. And so we're asking that the university look at what it is that students are looking for that the university needs to provide, which it -- and a little bit more specifically than you deal with in the cultural information in the plan. Because there are -- there seem to be some quite specific needs for this campus, and Milt has the documentation. So perhaps he could fill you in.

Thanks.

MR. PHEGLEY: Any additional comments?

(No responses.)

Okay. As I said, we are not prepared to give any detailed responses to any comments or questions this evening. But there were a couple of issues raised which do have short answers to them. And so I'd like to provide those, if I can.

A question was asked about existing and planned student housing. We currently house 32 percent of the students on campus. Because we recognize that housing is an important issue, and one that is going to be important in
terms of the university's future, the 2004 Long-Range Development Plan provides a goal of housing 50 percent of the student population on the campus. That number is achievable in terms of the allocation of land and other facilities. We also believe that that's the maximum amount of students that would choose to live on campus. That would be our market -- ability to market to students, that other students choose to live off campus or in other -- you know, farther away from the campus. But 50 percent is the goal within the Long-Range Development Plan.

A question was asked about the -- Sherri?

MS. LIGHTNER: The 50 percent, does that apply only to undergraduate or graduate students?

MR. PHEGLEY: Both undergraduate and graduate students.

MS. LIGHTNER: Okay. Both would be 50 percent --

MR. PHEGLEY: It'd be 50 percent.

(Multiple simultaneous speakers from the audience; indiscernible.)

MR. PHEGLEY: Total of the total student population.

MS. LIGHTNER: Okay.

THE REPORTER: I'm going to have a hard time picking up the questions if they're not at the microphone.

MR. PHEGLEY: Sure.
Second, it was asked about the eucalyptus trees in the area of Poole Street and Azul Street that have been marked. We have been unable to determine what those white dots mean.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Yes, but that was the answer on August 5th, and today's the 27th. I mean, I had hoped that hopefully there'd be some information --

MR. PHEGLEY: We don't have --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Any communication with (not at microphone; indiscernible).

MR. PHEGLEY: No. I mean, UCSD Physical Plant Services did not do it. Design and Construction did not do it. No UCSD entity says that they did it. In terms of looking at the trees, in terms of looking at trees that are diseased or dead as opposed to trees that are healthy, there's no -- there's white dots on all of them. So --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: (Not at microphone; indiscernible.)

MR. PHEGLEY: Right. So I think that the best advice at this point is to ignore the white dots. They have no meaning.

(Multiple simultaneous speakers from the audience; indiscernible.)

MR. PHEGLEY: Well, you are assuming that we know
who marked them. We don't know. The markings mean nothing.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Maybe it's an art project that (not at microphone; indiscernible).

MR. PHEGLEY: There was a question asked about -- in terms of review and approval of the Long-Range Development Plan and the EIR. It is true that in terms of the plan itself, the UC Board of Regents is the decision-maker and the deciding authority. In terms of other governmental agencies, such as the City of San Diego, Department of Fish and Game, Fish and Wildlife Service, the Coastal Commission, all of those agencies are identified under CEQA as responsible agencies. So they do have a role in this process, and we have sent the Notice of Preparation to those agencies. We've received comments already from a number of agencies. They will be consulted through the process, and they are free to provide their input to this process.

CEQA, in terms of the university's plan, is a very important process, because even though the university does not require approval, for instance, from the City of San Diego for individual projects, it's the city the provides water and sewer service to the campus. It's the city and state transportation systems that provide the road capacity for campus traffic. And so there's a direct
relationship between the campus plans and the plans of the surrounding communities and other agencies. That relationship between plans is something that will be discussed in detail in the Environmental Impact Report.

In terms of Coastal Commission approval, a portion of the campus is in the coastal zone, and the campus does go to the Coastal Commission for review and approval of individual projects. In addition to that, we would hope that the Coastal Commission would take a look at the Long-Range Development Plan and the EIR and provide some comments in terms of an overall approach or overall assessment of campus development as it relates to the responsibilities of the Coastal Commission.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Can I ask you just a question about -- what part of --

THE REPORTER: Ma'am, could you go up to the --

MR. PHEGLEY: No, no. I'll repeat your question. Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: What part of the campus is in the coastal zone?

MR. PHEGLEY: Okay. The question is, what portion of the campus is in the coastal zone? It's -- for lack of a better description, it's all of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography campus and the northern half of the main campus west of Interstate 5. So none of the...
property east of Interstate 5 is within the coastal zone. The portion of the campus that is in the coastal zone, if you sort of drew a diagonal across the campus from Interstate 5 and a Drive over to North Torrey Pines Road and La Jolla Shores, that's about the coastal zone boundary. Everything north of that is in the coastal zone. Everything south of it is not in the coastal zone.

Sherri.

MS. LIGHTNER: Who approves the EIR?

MR. PHEGLEY: The question is, who approves the Environmental Impact Report? The final decision-maker on the Environmental Impact Report is the UC Board of Regents.

MS. LIGHTNER: Because there is a new state law that the city attorney was ruling on related to the approval of environmental documents. The public has to be able to appeal to elected representatives. I can get you the specific law. It went into effect in January of 2003. Does that impact the Environmental Impact Review (sic)?

MR. PHEGLEY: I'm not aware of that, but we have experts here that'll take a look at it.

MS. LIGHTNER: Do you want the AB number on it?

MR. HOWLETT: I'm familiar with it.

MR. PHEGLEY: You are? Okay. Kim's familiar with it. So --

MS. LIGHTNER: (Not at microphone;
MR. PHEGLEY: There was a question asked regarding assessment of traffic impacts related to campus visitors or others who are not included in the students, faculty and staff population numbers. Those impacts in terms of the numbers of those people and impacts from them will be assessed in the traffic analysis portion of the Environmental Impact Report. So we're taking a look not only at the permanent -- if you want to call it permanent campus population -- but also visitors, and in the case of medical enterprises, the patients that come to medical enterprises on campus.

I think that was the easy group of questions. If anyone else has an easy question, I'll attempt to answer that also.

Sherri.

MS. LIGHTNER: At the next meeting, could you designate parking for us? That one lot over there is completely closed.

MR. PHEGLEY: Okay.

MS. LIGHTNER: I hope I don't get a ticket.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: (Not at microphone; indiscernible) only one hour.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Yes. The lots that were designated have one-hour parking
meters.

MR. PHEGLEY: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: It's an hour-and-a-half meeting, and so --

MR. PHEGLEY: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: -- it's not going to work.

MR. PHEGLEY: We will work on that.

Susan.

MS. GOULIAN: I've been at several meetings with you about very specific problems in the area. There's a lack of trust that the community feels that the university has failed them. It goes back to, I think, even building the aquarium and the understanding that Expedition Road would not be open, it would be blocked off. At one time, there was even a fence at the -- a gate at the top. Now that gate has disappeared.

So we want to work with the university. The community feels it's in their best interest. And, of course, it's in the university's best interest. I think perhaps more communication and more openness would be very helpful.

MR. PHEGLEY: Thank you.

Joe.

MR. GUSFIELD: I have a question (not at
microphone; indiscernible). Has any thought been given to possible changes in the aging of student population and its impact on transportation and housing?

MR. PHEGLEY: The question is, what, in terms of demographics of the student population, how might that affect transportation and housing issues? I don't know if that's considered in the factors, but that's certainly something we can take a look at and get back to you.

Ruth.

MS. STRITCH: At a previous meeting, the meeting was recorded, and several promises were made by the university at that time. We have not received a transcript of that meeting, as promised. And if the report is available, we would like to have it.

MR. PHEGLEY: Okay. We indicated that those meetings with regard to the machine shop would be tape recorded. There was never a plan to prepare a transcript. I do have copies of the tapes of the first two meetings for you.

MS. STRITCH: Thank you.

MR. PHEGLEY: And we'll get the additional two meetings also.

Any other questions?

MS. MOORE: And I don't know if this quite applies to the EIR, but I think it might. I notice that
there's going to be an over 110 -- I think a 100 percent increase in staff. The student body will increase by about 30 percent, the staff by over a hundred percent. I would hope the Long-Range Development Plan would please consider new technology and wireless communication. I think it's inappropriate to house all facilities at UCSD. I think with satellite facilities, wireless telecommunications, and all of the progress that is made on this campus in those areas, I'm not seeing that included in the plan at all.

With so many universities now providing online courses, not using traditional classroom environments, and UCSD (not at microphone; indiscernible) college presumably was going to become a leader in this. I think that the LRDP is in actual fact sadly lacking if you have a look at it in relation to the possibilities of wireless technology, or technology in general. I hope that will be addressed in the plan, because I think many of the problems to do with transportation, parking, and so on, could be very clearly mitigated if UCSD and the UC system in general looked very carefully at the way in which businesses use portals and so on in order to provide those types of services that prevent people from having to drive all the way here.

So I didn't see mention of that in the plan, and I would hope that with the great grants that UCSD has just received from the state and so on, maybe that's something
you could look at, if not in the next nine months, at least in the future.

MR. PHEGLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Any last comments?

(No responses.)

Okay. Again, I'd like to thank everyone for attending, and emphasize the importance and the desirability of signing the sign-in sheet. As we move through this process in the next few months, we do want to stay in contact with you. So by providing us with your name, address and e-mail, that will be a way that we can do that.

Thank you.

(Meeting adjourned at 7:22 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

I, Michael J. Williamson, certify, under penalty of perjury, that the foregoing is a verbatim transcription prepared from the electronic sound recording produced at the proceedings in the above-entitled matter, and is a true and accurate transcript of said proceedings to the best of my ability and belief.
COMMENT LETTERS
RECEIVED ON THE AUGUST 4, 2003
NOTICE OF PREPARATION

- U.S. Marine Corps, Miramar, Colonel P.S. Parkhurst
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Southern California Cleanup Operations Branch, Thomas M. Cota, Chief
- San Diego’s Regional Planning Agency, Christine Rychel, Senior Transportation Planner
- City of San Diego, Cathy Cibit, Environmental Review Manager
- San Diego City Schools, Instructional Facilities Planning Department, Joe Wolf, Director
- San Diego Audubon Society, James A. Peugh, Coastal and Wetlands Conservation Chair
- Brenda Alpinieri
- Gary and Denise David
- TransitNow, Michael Duffy, President
- Gail Forbes
- Ann Heinemann
- Susan Moore
- Linda Smith
- Cecilia Yguerabide
- Su-Mei Yu
- Clive Granger
- Mary C. Coakley
- Sherri S. Lightner
- Benny Chier
- Courtney Ann Coyle, Esq.
- Penelope Bourk
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO
CAMPUS PLANNING: PHYSICAL PLANNING
ATTN CATHERINE PRESMYK
9500 GILMAN DRIVE MAIL CODE 0965
LA JOLLA CA 92093-0965

RE: UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLAN; NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF DRAFT
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
2004 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Dear Ms. Presmyk,

This is in response to the Notice of Preparation of Draft Environmental Impact Report, which addresses a Long Range Development Plan within the University Community Planning area.

The proposed site is contained within the “Miramar Airport Influence Area” identified in the 1992 Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) and will be affected by operations of military fixed and rotary-wing aircraft transiting to and from Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar. The proposed project is located outside the adopted and projected 60-65 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise contours and is consistent with the land use compatibility guidelines for Miramar operations. This location is affected by the Seawolf Departure Corridor for fixed-wing operations. Occupants will both see and hear fixed and rotary-wing aircraft and experience varying degrees of noise and vibration. Consequently, we are recommending full disclosure of noise and visual impacts to all initial and subsequent purchasers, lessees, or other potential occupants.

Normal hours of operation at MCAS Miramar are as follows:

Monday through Thursday 7:00 a.m. to 12:00 midnight
Friday 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.
Saturday, Sunday, Holidays 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.
MCAS Miramar is a master air station, and as such, can operate 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. Fiscal and manpower constraints, as well as efforts to reduce the noise impact of our operations on the surrounding community, impose the above hours of operation. Circumstances frequently arise which require an extension of these operating hours.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this land use proposal. If we may be of any further assistance, please contact Ms. Rhonda Benally at (858) 577-6603.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

P. S. PARKHURST
Colonel, U.S. Marine Corps
Community Plans and Liaison Officer
By direction of the Commander
August 13, 2003

Ms. Catherine J. Presmyk  
Assistant Director Environmental Planning  
Physical Planning Office  
University of California, San Diego  
9500 Gilman Drive, MC 0965  
La Jolla, California 92093-0965

NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE 2004 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO (SCH #2003081023)

Dear Ms. Presmyk:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has received your Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the above-mentioned Project.

Based on the review of the document, DTSC's comments are as follows:

1) The draft EIR needs to identify and determine whether current or historic uses at the Project site have resulted in any release of hazardous wastes/substances at the Project area.

2) The draft EIR needs to identify any known or potentially contaminated site within the proposed Project area. For all identified sites, the draft EIR needs to evaluate whether conditions at the site pose a threat to human health or the environment.

3) The draft EIR should identify the mechanism to initiate any required investigation and/or remediation for any site that may require remediation, and the government agency to provide appropriate regulatory oversight. If hazardous materials/wastes were stored at the site, an environmental assessment should be conducted to determine if a release has occurred. If so, further studies should be carried out to delineate the nature and extent of the contamination. Also, it is necessary to estimate the potential threat to public health and/or the environment posed by the site. It may be necessary to determine if an expedited
response action is required to reduce existing or potential threats to public health or the environment. If no immediate threat exists, the final remedy should be implemented in compliance with state regulations and policies rather than excavation of soil prior to any assessments.

4) All environmental investigation and/or remediation should be conducted under a Workplan which is approved by a regulatory agency that has jurisdiction to oversee hazardous waste cleanups.

5) If the subject property was previously used for agriculture, onsite soils could contain pesticide residues. Proper investigation and remedial actions should be conducted to ensure the site does not pose a risk to the future residents.

6) If any of the adjacent properties of the project site are contaminated with hazardous chemicals, and if the proposed project is within 2,000 feet from a contaminated site, then the proposed development may fall under the “Border Zone of a Contaminated Property.” Appropriate precautions should be taken prior to construction if the proposed project is on a “Border Zone Property.”

7) If building structures are planned to be demolished/renovated, an investigation for the presence of lead-based paints and asbestos containing materials (ACMs). If the presence of lead-based paints or ACMs are identified, proper precautions should be taken during demolition activities. Additionally, the contaminants should be remediated in compliance with the California environmental regulations.

8) If during construction/demolition of the project, soil and/or groundwater contamination is suspected, construction/demolition in the area should cease and appropriate Health and Safety procedures should be implemented. If it is determined that contaminated soil and/or groundwater exist, the draft EIR should identify how any required investigation and/or remediation will be conducted, and the government agency to provide appropriate regulatory oversight.

DTSC provides guidance for the Preliminary Endangerment Assessment (PEA) preparation and cleanup oversight through the Voluntary Cleanup Program (VCP). For additional information on the VCP, please visit DTSC’s web site at www.dtsc.ca.gov.
Ms. Catherine J. Presmyk  
August 13, 2003  
Page 3 of 3

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Mr. Johnson P. Abraham,  
Project Manager at (714) 484-5476.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Thomas M. Cota, Chief  
Southern California Cleanup Operations Branch - Cypress Office

cc:  Governor’s Office of Planning and Research  
State Clearinghouse  
P.O. Box 3044  
Sacramento, California 95812-3044

Mr. Guenther W. Moskat, Chief  
Planning and Environmental Analysis Section  
CEQA Tracking Center  
Department of Toxic Substances Control  
P.O. Box 806  
Sacramento, California 95812-0806
August 26, 2003

Mr. Jeffrey A. Steindorf
Assistant Vice Chancellor - Campus Planning
University of California, San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive, MC 0006
La Jolla, CA 92093-0006

Dear Mr. Steindorf:

Subject: UCSD 2004 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN RESPONSE TO INITIAL STUDY/NOTICE OF PREPARATION

On behalf of the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), I am responding to the Initial Study/Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) update of the Long Range Development Plan (2004 LRDP).

The EIR should consider and address both the benefits and potential impacts of the proposed light rail transit (LRT) and bus transit improvements on campus. There is an advanced planning study currently analyzing several LRT alignments and station locations. Upon completion of the study this fall, a recommendation for alignment selection will be taken to the SANDAG Transportation Committee for approval. In addition, we are pursuing preliminary engineering and environmental work on the Super Loop (a high-frequency circulator bus project) and modifications to regional bus routes that would also serve the campus. These transit facilities will provide significant benefits by providing front-door transit access to UCSD. In addition, any impacts on the proposed LRT and bus transit facilities, operations, or circulation should be identified and addressed in the EIR.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the Notice of Preparation for the LRDP. Please contact me at 619.557.4540 if you have any questions or need further information about the LRT and bus transit facilities proposed for UCSD.

Sincerely,

Christine Rychel
Senior Transportation Planner

JGarde - L-UCSDLRDP.CRYCLE

c: Milt Phegley, UCSD
September 2, 2003

VIA FACSIMILE TO (858) 534-8957

Jeffrey A. Steindorf
Assistant Vice Chancellor Campus Planning
University of California, San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive, MC 0006
La Jolla, CA 92093-0006

Dear Mr. Steindorf:

Subject: Notice of Preparation - Draft Environmental Impact Report
UCSD 2004 Long Range Development Plan
(UCSD Project Number 968146; City of San Diego Project Number 23-06)

Thank you for the opportunity to review the above-named Notice of Preparation. The Notice of Preparation was reviewed by the Environmental Analysis Section of the Land Development Division of the Development Services Department and found to be adequate for the proposed project.

We would appreciate receiving a copy of the draft and final documents when available. The City’s contact person for this project is Donna Clark, Environmental Analysis Section, 1222 First Avenue, MS 501, San Diego, CA 92101, (619) 446-5387.

Sincerely,

Allison Raap for
Cathy Cibit
Environmental Review Manager (Acting)

cc: Allison Raap, Senior Planner, EAS
EAS Review and Comment File
August 18, 2003

Jeffrey A. Steindorf
Assistant Vice Chancellor Campus Planning
University of California, San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive, MC 0006
La Jolla, CA 92093-0006

Mr. Steindorf:

Our department (Instructional Facilities Planning Department, San Diego City Schools) has received the “Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2004 Long Range Development Plan for the University of California, San Diego.”

Our primary interest in any development plan is the development’s impact on elementary and secondary schools. Including an estimate of K-12 student generation in the public services section of the Draft EIR would be helpful to our own long-range planning and would enable us to comment on the potential impact relative to our existing and planned school facilities.

We have not quantified the number of our students with parents attending UCSD or other post-secondary institutions, but UCSD or other UC schools may have results of surveys or other institutional records that would help your planners estimate the average number of school-age children per additional UCSD student. Ideally, the Draft EIR would include an estimate of students by elementary (grades K-5 or age 5-10), middle (grades 6-8 or age 11-13), and senior high (9-12 or age 14-17).

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the scope of the EIR. Please address future correspondence to Joe Wolf, Director. Other address information is unchanged.

Sincerely,

Joe Wolf
Director
Instructional Facilities Planning Department

"The mission of San Diego City Schools is to improve student achievement by supporting teaching and learning in the classroom."
August 15, 2003

Jeffrey A. Steindorf
Assistant Vice Chancellor Campus Planning
University of California, San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive, MC 0006
La Jolla, CA 92093-0006

Re: Project # 968146

Dear Mr. Steindorf,

The San Diego Audubon Society is particularly interested in two broad areas—the management and control of pollution from stormwater runoff, and the conservation of habitat, primarily coastal sage scrub, that might result from UCSD 2004 Long Range Development Plan.

Given the physical location of UCSD, it is important that stormwater runoff be well managed and monitored for 1) erosion control, especially as it might degrade sensitive and fragile seaside cliff areas, and 2) pollution of ground water and near-shore marine habitats.

We urge that projects and landscaping be designed to inherently reduce stormwater problems and that effective Best Management Practices (BMPs) be implemented in a comprehensive manner to additionally prevent stormwater pollution from degrading sensitive terrestrial habitats, groundwater, and nearshore marine habitats.

The USCD campus contains some unique and highly functional habitat, that has suffered excessive degradation from previous projects. To minimize the impacts of future projects that will be guided by the LRDP, maximum attention needs to be paid to 1) the retention of the remaining viable habitat within the Plan area, 2) avoiding as much as possible the fragmentation of habitat, and 3) mitigation that will fully offset the functions and values of habitat that can not be avoided in future developments. This is especially critical for the conservation and protection of sensitive species, e.g., California gnatcatcher, which dependent on already scarce habitats, such as the coastal sage scrub habitat community. Preserving a maximum quantity and quality of indigenous habitat on campus will have educational and quality of life value for students.

We urge that the Long Range Plan and its environmental analysis provide projects and alternatives that will fully protect these diminishing natural resources. San Diego Audubon Society appreciates the opportunity to comment on this project. For questions or follow-up, the undersigned can be reached at 619-224-4591 or peugh@cox.net. Please keep us informed of future steps regarding this project.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

James A. Peugh
Coastal and Wetlands Conservation Chair
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
FOR THE
2004 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

COMMENT FORM

Please provide your comments on the following lines and direct to Catherine Presmyk via fax (858) 822-5990 or U.S. mail (Physical Planning, 9500 Gilman Drive M.C. 0965, La Jolla, CA 92093-0965). Comments must be received by 5pm on September 4, 2003.

1. What role did Mr. Milton Phlegory, who worked MANY years for the Calif. Coastal Commission, have in persuading the Coastal Commission to permit A machine shop in Sea view canyon, AND denying neighbors bordering the canyon invitations to the original hearing?

2. Why is the University unwilling to find suitable space for a machine shop in an industrial area. Industrial areas are available in Sorrento Valley which is extremely convenient to the campus.

Please provide your:
NAME: Brenda Alpinieri
ADDRESS: 2678 Prestwick Court La Jolla 92037
PHONE: 858-587-0702
EMAIL ADDRESS: LOUALP@RICOCHET.COM
To Catherine Presmyk

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
FOR THE
2004 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

COMMENT FORM

Please provide your comments on the following lines and direct to Catherine Presmyk via fax (858) 822-5990 or U.S. mail (Physical Planning, 9500 Gilman Drive M.C. 0965, La Jolla, CA 92093-0965). Comments must be received by 5pm on September 4, 2003.

While our immediate concerns relate to the ECEC developments adjacent to Azul St., we are more disturbed by the long term plans for UCSD development in our neighborhood. We expect that others who reside within the UCSD environs have similar concerns. Please consider the following questions:

1. Maintenance of Eucalyptus grove and surrounding area. University is on a building frenzy, including the construction projects outlined in the LRDP. State funding for infrastructure is likely to be significantly reduced. Already, "park" regions on campus are not routinely kept up. How does UCSD plan to remove trash and repair damage that will occur in the new developments and along adjacent areas?

2. Parking on neighborhood streets during construction by construction workers constitutes a major intrusion on the impacted community. Workers arrive at 6 AM or earlier, are not all quiet, and some leave trash. UCSD has been reluctant to enforce off site parking (glider port) with shuttle service to job sites. Will UCSD be willing in the future to engage the contractors to require that their construction workers not intrude on neighborhood streets?

3. UCSD has never enforced the 25 mph speed limit on Expedition Way, and crossing the road at certain popular locations, where blind spots exist, can be quite hazardous. Increased traffic will compound the problem. How will UCSD address traffic safety issues?

4. How will UCSD improve its community relations record with regard to development planning? You need to actively engage impacted residents very early in the planning process, both to incorporate concerns that might otherwise not be apparent, and to avoid increasingly bad community relations. The issue probably relates to the planning process itself, rather than simply to communications.

Please provide your:

NAME: Gary and Denise David
ADDRESS: 9477 Poole St., La Jolla, CA 92037-1143
PHONE: 858-455-1385
EMAIL ADDRESS: g david@san.rr.com
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
FOR THE
2004 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

COMMENT FORM

Please provide your comments on the following lines and direct to Catherine Presmyk via fax (858) 822-5990 or U.S. mail (Physical Planning, 9500 Gilman Drive M.C. 0965, La Jolla, CA 92093-0965). Comments must be received by 5pm on September 4, 2003.
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Please provide your
NAME: Michael Duffey
ADDRESS: 4120 La Jolla Shores Dr., San Diego, CA 92109
PHONE: (858) 457-5141
EMAIL ADDRESS: md@ucsd.edu
Public Comment
Submitted: September 6, 2003
Re: 2004 Long Range Development Plan
Attention: Catherine Presmyk
VIA FACSIMILE:

Pursuant to CEQA and Title 42 U.S.C. the following impacts require mitigation and resolution:

Recitals
- Traffic, congestion, noise pollution, air pollution and public health and safety issues related to the increased growth of UCSD and the 2004 Land Use Plan.

Major Impact Zones
- The development boundaries of Genesee, Regents, La Jolla Village Drive and I-5 should be the subject of full EIR reports prior to further construction and development also known as 'East Campus'.
- It is recommended that 'light transit' linkages to the new coaster station on Nobel be developed and implemented as soon as possible. Clean air vehicles such as the UCSD shuttle be greatly enhanced and expanded accompanied by faculty and student 'incentives' to park-n-ride at the new coaster station, planned completion 2004.
- UCSD become a major participant in the 'super-loop' flex-trolley system now under consideration by the City of San Diego. Immediately replace surface parking on Genesee and Regents with a major underground parking structure of at least 1,500 spaces for park-n-ride in conjunction with a 'transit terminal' for the super-loop-flex trolley system.
- Substantially increase density of housing located at Regents and La Jolla Village Drive. This site should be a top priority to fully build out to maximize new housing demands and major housing shortfalls. The new higher density complex of housing at par with Costa Verde apartments
should be ‘transit’ friendly with transit center pick-up and drop-off points throughout the site.

- Design and build a ‘light transit only’ express conveyance bridge over I-5 to ease transportation congestion between the west campus and the newly emerging and dense east campus.
- Require Medical-Academic/Science Research Park staff and employees to park n ride and offer substantial ‘transit incentives’ to reduce ADT’s along congested existing traffic routes such as Regents and Genesee.

Summary

UCSD and its affiliates are at the leading edge of technology; UCSD should be a community leader in setting the example for ‘smart transit’ and ‘smart land use’ and demonstrate by modeling ‘how’ our community can benefit from UCSD technological breakthroughs. UCSD and UTC-UC stand collectively at the crossroads of innovation, we have a clear choice, either business as usual building or designing automobile depend academic-research communities such as the isolated Genesee-Torrey Pines Research Park or become a model for state-of-the-art urban planning and transportation.

A major objective should be to minimize the negative impacts associated with new construction, traffic, congestion, noise and pollution through primarily residential neighborhoods such as Las Palmas, La Jolla Colony and the Regents Road corridor where approximately 12,000 residents reside. UCSD has much to offer our community, however, UCSD must become more pro-active in implementing innovative solutions to the very community challenges they create.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Duffey, TransitNow
A Public Benefit Corporation
Residential Stakeholder, Las Palmas, La Jolla Colony
4120 Porte de Merano, #85
San Diego, California 92122
The map used to present the LRDevPlan is inadequate. Campus roads are not labeled. The scale is too small to detect locations and boundaries. The designation used in the key, "academic/community-oriented" fails to provide sufficient information to distinguish what will occupy those locations. The theater district is not designated. A note on the map indicates that many buildings may contain parking spaces, but this is not marked. It is possible to mark a map to show parking. The use of the term "neighborhood" in describing campus plans is confusing to those not familiar with jargon. No parking lot should be built in the S10 South neighbor campus at El Prado Grande + La Jolla Shores Dr. This is the last water view along the shores and is identified as a public view by the Community Plan. The University should comply with zoning regulations of the city of San Diego in the location of facilities adjoining single family residences. The juxtaposition of manufacturing/machinist shop and single family should not be permitted. Two spectacular ocean vistas should be preserved.

1) La Jolla Village Dr + Torrey Pines (North of Allen Field to Aquarium Road)
2) La Jolla Shores Drive (west of married housing) between Horizonte & La Jolla Shores Drive

Gail Forbes  858-454-5561
Address: 2385 Calle del Oro, La Jolla, CA 92037
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
FOR THE
2004 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

COMMENT FORM

Please provide your comments on the following lines and direct to Catherine Presmyk via fax (858) 822-5990 or U.S. mail (Physical Planning, 9500 Gilman Drive M.C. 0965, La Jolla, CA 92093-0965). Comments must be received by 5pm on September 4, 2003.

Keep all university related projects out of the surrounding residential community. No eminent domain for UCSD expansion. Accommodate skilled and other non-university-related entities in commercial zones, not residential.

Too big is too impersonal -- look into a satellite in Chula Vista. There was land offered to expand UCSD. If ICA need to accommodate nuclear students, UCSD could eventually become a separate campus-like SDSU & San Marcos. Too bad there is.

Please provide your:
NAME: Anna Leinemann
ADDRESS: 8981 Cliffridge Lane 92037
PHONE: 858 453-2150
EMAIL ADDRESS: a.leinemann@eudora.com

Also why does the planner panel come to head from the community?
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
FOR THE
2004 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

NAME: SUSAN (SUE) MOORE
ADDRESS: 8944 NOTTINGHAM PLACE, LA JOLLA, CA 92037
PHONE: (858) 450 - 6758
EMAIL: suc@mind.ucsd.edu

In addition to the comments I submitted as part of the taped meeting on August 27th, 2003, which I understand will be entered into the record, I would like to add the
following brief comments. If you would prefer that these comments be more detailed
please contact me and I will expand upon them.

1. Prior to the commencement of the new LRDP there should be a detailed
analysis of the successes and failures of the 1989 LRDP. This process should
include public input in the presence of UCSD’s planners and legal
representatives. Clearly the 1989 plan has not worked. Cars litter the local
neighbourhoods, the shopping malls are virtually inaccessible as students and
staff park for extended periods of time, and the local community is now home
to an illegal, code violating student facility that has not been located according
to the existing University plan. Further, the local residents have absolutely no
trust in the UCSD administration and are aware that the City of San Diego
staff and a council member predict that the neighbourhood around La Jolla
Scenic Drive, and North Torrey Pines Road will be declared a blighted area
and rezoned as Mixed Use/Commercial, or simply taken over by eminent
domain. (Reassuring to know that the houses into which we plough our
resources and care are considered so expendable by the very institution that
employs so many of these residents.)

2. The LRDP is so vague and lacking in content that it is difficult (presumably
by design) for there to be clearly communicated opinions on the content and
the process. We need specifics.

3. I would respectfully request that the incoming, interim Chancellor be apprised
of the responses to this initial part of the LRDP/EIR and that community
members, especially those already facing the impact of a 200 strong UCSD
student affiliated group that should have been located in the UC urban nodes,
or advised to purchase Site 675 adjacent to the theatre expansion, be invited to
that meeting. As should the residents who have already been affected by
broken UCSD promises concerning the Birch Aquarium and are now dealing
with Seaweed Canyon.
To: UCSD Physical Planning  

Re: Comments Regarding UCSD’s 2004 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

Thank you for giving the public an opportunity to review and comment on the UCSD 2004 Long Range Development Plan. It is hoped that the University will carefully consider and respond to the community’s concerns in the preparation and actualization of its LRDP and EIR.

Questions and Comments:

As a homeowner in the single-family residential zoned neighborhood adjacent to UCSD, I am greatly concerned about the immediate and long term effects that the University’s expansion efforts will have on the residential community.

1. What protection or assurances do residents have that the University will not encroach into our neighborhood in order to provide for its growing student and campus community population?

2. Will our neighborhood be slated for redevelopment and our homes turned into student use facilities as was done at SDSU (San Diego State University)?

With regard to student use facilities: There has long been a need by numerous student groups for an ecumenical center or similar meeting space on campus.

1. How will the University accommodate this need in the future?

2. How does the University plan to develop the parcel of land (shown for Academic use) that is located along North Torrey Pines Road, just south of the Torrey Pines Center, east of the Gliderport, and north of the hotel/conference center?

Given its close proximity to existing student activities centers (RIMAC), dorm rooms, and parking facilities, it would appear to be an excellent location for an ecumenical center or multipurpose gathering place for students as well as the wider campus community. Funding for this facility could come from private institutions or other benefactors interested in supporting this type of facility for the benefit of UCSD’s campus community.

What plans does the University have for the city-owned parcel (Site 675) located on UCSD’s main campus adjacent to the theatre district?

1. Could this parcel be traded for a similar-sized parcel of University owned land and incorporated into the site mentioned above to provide a ‘city-owned’ parcel for use by the student group desiring its own facility on campus grounds?

Again, thank you for your consideration in addressing these comments and concerns.

Sincerely,

Linda Smith

Mailing address: P.O. Box 12287, La Jolla, CA 92039-2287
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
FOR THE
2004 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

COMMENT FORM

Please provide your comments on the following lines and direct to Catherine Presmyk via fax (858) 822-5990 or U.S. mail (Physical Planning, 9500 Gilman Drive M.C. 0965, La Jolla, CA 92037-0965). Comments must be received by 5pm on September 4, 2003.

Another location for ECEC2

I would like to request that other areas be considered for the ECEC2. Currently, the area that has been chosen for this development is in the Eucalyptus Groves between Arbol Street and Expedition Way. I suggest reconsidering the other sites that were considered previously or possibly consider the undeveloped area in back of Canyon View Pool, adjacent to the Campus Services Complex and the area by the undergrad and graduate housing. See attached aerial map. Currently, the only projects in that area that are listed in the Long Range Development plan are the expansion of the Canyon View Pool and a Multi-Purpose Roadway. This would be an excellent location with minimal impact on the traffic and congestion for the surrounding community than it would be if placed in the current planned area. This would leave staff and faculty with at least two entry and exit ways (possibly more options) to the freeway, via Villa La Jolla Drive or Voight Drive to Genesee. Therefore easing the congestion away from the main streets, i.e. North Torrey Pines Road. You should also consider this area for the SIO machine shop that is being built in Seaweed Canyon as it would fit within the scope of the Campus Services Complex.

Please provide your.
NAME: Cecilia Yguerabide
ADDRESS: 9505 Poole St, La Jolla, CA 92037
PHONE: 658-453-4188
EMAIL ADDRESS: nina.esp@pacbell.net
Please provide your comments on the following lines and direct to
Catherine Presmyk via fax (858) 822-5990 or U.S. mail (Physical Planning,
Parking Impact)

As UCSD continues to grow, the parking lots continue to shrink. Around the university, many of
the new buildings have been built on current parking, therefore eliminating parking for many of
your staff and further pushing them to the boundaries of UCSD. For example, the Biology Bldg.,
Eleanor Roosevelt College, The School of Pharmacology Bldg., and trailers behind the School of
Medicine have all been built on existing parking lots. According to your Long Range Plan, there
are only a few parking structures being built (including Revelle). The only new structure that was
built was the Gilman structure which already proves to be inadequate. Many times that structure
has posted signs saying “Lot Full” for staff and students. For example, on 8/25 there was a ‘lot
full’ sign posted for the student parking and fall classes have not even begun yet. The practice of
building on parking lots, along with building additional structures, has created an influx of staff
and students not being able to find available parking. In addition, raised parking rates,
disgruntled staff and students forgo their parking permits and park in the surrounding residential
(L.J. Shores Dr./Poole St., La Jolla Scenic Dr.), and commercial areas (Villa La Jolla Drive
businesses). This is evidenced by increased traffic flow on the residential streets, increased
accidents, drivers exceeding the speed limit (for example, Expedition Way and Poole Street),
and creates hazardous conditions for children playing around their residences or simply crossing
the street. UCSD needs to provide adequate and affordable parking for their staff and students
and stop expecting the residents and local business to be impacted from their overflow.

Please provide your
NAME: Cecilia Yguerabide
ADDRESS: 9505 Poole St., La Jolla, CA 92037
PHONE: 858-453-4158
EMAIL ADDRESS: ninaspe@pacbell.net
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
FOR THE
2004 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

COMMENT FORM

Please provide your comments on the following lines and direct to Catherine Presmyk via fax (858) 822-5990 or U.S. mail (Physical Planning, 9500 Gilman Drive M.C. 0965, La Jolla, CA 92037). Comments must be received by 5pm on September 4, 2003.

Traffic flow and congestion, and the ECEC2 development.

As a resident, the biggest concern is the traffic flow and congestion. For the past several years there has been an increase in traffic and congestion (especially during peak hours) between La Jolla Village Drive, North Torrey Pines Road and La Jolla Shore Drive and up to Genesee with the area around Expedition Way and N. Torrey Pines being the worst. With the current new building being developed along North Torrey Pines Rd (Eleanor Roosevelt College, Biology Bldg., the Blackhorse Farms Hotel, the new bldg. on Revelle Campus) it is obvious that this congestion will increase. To put the ECEC2 in the current area that UCSD has selected (the "Eucalyptus Groves"), it is obvious that traffic congestion in the area around Expedition Way and Torrey Pines Road will be further complicated. The building of this development needs to be seriously considered for the impact it will have on the traffic congestion in the surrounding community. The premise for locating the ECEC2 in the groves just for the sake of close convenience for SIO faculty is weak and does not consider the impact on the community as it relates to traffic flow and congestions along Expedition Way, N. Torrey Pines Rd. and Torrey Pines Rd.

Please provide your:
NAME: Cecilia Yguerabide
ADDRESS: 9505 Poole St, La Jolla, CA 92037
PHONE: 858-453-4158
EMAIL ADDRESS: nina@espe.pacbell.net
Jolla Campus 2002 Aerial Photo

Campus Services Complex and Physical Plant

Canyon View
August 19, 2003

University of California, San Diego
Physical Planning
9500 Gilman Dr. M.C. 0965
La Jolla, CA. 92093-0965

Attention: Catherine Presmyk

Dear Ms. Presmyk,

I am writing in regards to the solicitation the university is asking in regard to its 2004 long range development plan and the environmental impact it will have. Here is my comment:

I object to the University of California, San Diego’s 2004 long range development plan for the following reasons:

1. The university’s insatiable appetite for expansion will destroy one of few areas of natural reserve set aside and endowed to the university as the Pueblo Reserve. It has broken the promise to keep this gift as a natural reserve.

2. If the planned expansion includes the approval of the previous members of the university’s architectural committee which is responsible for the recent buildings on the university campus, then God helps us all. They are the ugliest bunch of buildings I have ever seen.

3. The planned expansion without consideration for additional infrastructure will result in more chaos with near impossible traffic congestion and limited parking in which we are now suffering. The neighborhood near the university has already absorbed the university’s overflowing parking problem to the extent that home owners could not even park in front of their homes.

4. The university is the worse neighbor one can ever wish for. It has no regards for the nearby residential neighborhood. I don’t want the university’s institution right next door to my home which will happen with this planned expansion. I have lived in my home during the past 22 years and when I was in need of assistance with homeless people, students moving into the neighborhood, parking problem, etc, I have yet received one returned telephone call from any of the officials on campus.

Su-Mei Yu
9463 Poole Street
La Jolla, CA. 92037
858 453-0555

cc: Senator Dede Alpert
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
FOR THE
2004 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

COMMENT FORM

Please provide your comments on the following lines and direct to Catherine Presmyk via fax (858) 822-5990 or U.S. mail (Physical Planning, 9500 Gilman Drive M.C. 0965, La Jolla, CA 92093-0965). Comments must be received by 5pm on September 4, 2003.

I find your population projections strange. I agree that student numbers will go to 30,000 or so, an increase of about 30%. But I doubt if faculty will increase 70% or staff by 100%. The government would not allow such changes.

Please provide your:
NAME: Clive Granger
ADDRESS: 8856 Robinhood Lane, La Jolla, CA 92037
PHONE:
EMAIL ADDRESS: cgranger@ucsd.edu
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
FOR THE
2004 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

COMMENT FORM

Please provide your comments on the following lines and direct to Catherine Presmyk via fax (858) 822-5990 or U.S. mail (Physical Planning, 9500 Gilman Drive M.C. 0965, La Jolla, CA 92037-0965). Comments must be received by 5pm on September 4, 2003.

Please keep me updated on future meetings and other communications. I am concerned about providing adequate open spaces, playing fields, limiting scale, considering adequacy of the infrastructure and impact on the community.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Please provide your:
NAME: MARY C. COAKLEY
ADDRESS: 8170 VALLECITOS #203, LA JOLLA, CA 92037
PHONE: (858) 459-2500 (619) 840-0250
EMAIL ADDRESS: coakleym(a)san.rr.com
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
FOR THE
2004 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

COMMENT FORM

Please provide your comments on the following lines and direct to Catherine Presmyk via fax (858) 822-5990 or U.S. mail (Physical Planning, 9500 Gilman Drive M.C. 0965, La Jolla, CA 92037-0965). Comments must be received by 5pm on September 4, 2003.

As a mitigation measure for the LRDP, give any UC owned land associated with the Torrey Pines Glider Port/FortRESS to the City of San Diego with condition that it be dedicated open space. Similar suggestion for other UC-owned parcels in the Coastal Zone, which are not contiguous with the main Campus.

NAME:  SHERRI S. LIGHTNER
ADDRESS:  8551 LA JOLLA SHORES DR.
TELEPHONE: (858) 551-0770
E-MAIL ADDRESS: sherri@lightner.net
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
FOR THE
2004 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

COMMENT FORM

Please provide your comments on the following lines and direct to Catherine Presmyk via fax (858) 822-5990 or U.S. mail (Physical Planning, 9500 Gilman Drive M.C. 0965, La Jolla, CA 92037-0965). Comments must be received by 5pm on September 4, 2003.

Air quality pollution must calculate emissions from construction trucks and trucks of construction workers who use high emitter trucks and commute from East County.

Traffic analysis must calculate Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) for vast majority of UCSD commuters who do not live nearby.

Analysis of alternatives to project must account for areas that do not have such expensive housing (long commute).

La Jolla Community Plan should have jurisdiction over UCSD because UCSD benefits from uses La Jolla name.

UCSD growth has definite incurred into residential via

Please provide your:
NAME: Benny Chien
ADDRESS: 2615 Ellentown Rd., La Jolla, CA 92037
PHONE: 858 450-9325
EMAIL ADDRESS: benny.chien@stanfordalumni.org

9/8/03
Catherine Presmyk  
UCSD Physical Planning Office  
9500 Gilman Drive, M.C. 0965  
San Diego, CA 92093-0965  

By Mail and Confirmed Fax: 858.822.5990  
September 12, 2003

Re: Comments on DRAFT UCSD 2004 Long Range Development Plan  
(dated July 28, 2003), Project No. 968146

Dear Ms. Presmyk:

This letter is sent on behalf of my clients, the La Jolla Farms Homeowners. The Homeowners appreciate this opportunity to comment on UCSD’s proposed Long Range Development Plan. Please include this letter in the public record for the project.

We understand that the Plan is anticipated to support the University through the planning horizon year of 2020-2021. We also understand that nine factors were considered in producing the Plan including non-academic program requirements, UCSD’s unique characteristics, environmental resources, need for support services and the opinions of various community stakeholders.

The Homeowners support both their quality of life in their residential neighborhood along La Jolla Farms and Blackgold Roads and UCSD’s necessary activities and development. This letter is sent in the spirit of seeing how a balance may be achieved between both sets of interests. Our concerns include:

- **Shared Uses.** While recognizing that UCSD’s internal needs are considerable, the Plan should also explore more opportunities for shared use and jointly funded facilities (such as parking, recreation and childcare) among institutions on the mesa (including the Salk Institute) to optimize use (and funds) and steer development away from sensitive coastal areas and external residential neighborhoods. This is particularly important as the Plan itself recognizes that these elements will be facing demand for added service;

- **Gliderport Area.** More information should be provided about the concept size, height, bulk and scale of the academic structures and the concept intensity of the major sports and recreation area proposed along Torrey Pines Scenic Drive (Gliderport Area) to better assess their potential compatibility with existing uses,
including external residential neighborhoods, sensitive habitats and external recreational uses and the potential impacts to adjacent institutions (including displacement of monthly Salk Institute parking) and the community (including excessive lighting associated with athletic fields and beach impact parking);

- **Plan Implementation.** Understanding that the EIR will determine what other necessary approvals and regulatory permits would be needed, what kind of environmental documents and public notice are anticipated to be provided when specific projects are proposed. This is of particular concern as the document will be a Programmatic EIR and the Homeowners want to be involved in any subsequent project specific analyses of concern to their properties;

- **Campus Maps.** The draft 2004 campus map differs from the 1989 map; in the 2004 map, the academic area along Torrey Pines Scenic Drive is reconfigured and expanded along the length of that Road and the northern section of Scripps Coastal Reserve appears to be redesignated as academic/community oriented from park designation. What are the impacts of these proposed revisions on the community, neighbors and our sensitive coastal environment and what notice of these proposed changes has been given to affected communities and the Coastal Commission;

We also respectfully request that a copy of the Plan’s draft environmental document be sent to the above address and ask that my office be placed on the notice list to receive the Final Plan and environmental document as well as notices for current and future UCSD childcare projects and developments that might occur along and near the Gliderport Area.

In sum, we are pleased that the University has stated its concern for the impact of future campus development on the surrounding community. We believe incorporation of our views into the Plan will satisfy the nine factors as well as meet or enhance the document’s stated purpose to provide a broad, coherent and adaptable framework to achieve UCSD’s academic and support program goals and to inform decisions concerning land use, that we all must live with into the foreseeable future.

Thank you for consideration of our comments.

Very truly yours,

Courtney Ann Coyle
Attorney at Law

Cc: Hon. Scott Peters, Councilmember
Laurinda Owens, California Coastal Commission
La Jolla Farms Homeowners Association
La Jolla Shores Association
La Jolla Town Council
Client file
Re: UCSD Planning Committee Scoping Meeting, August 27, 2003
Comments to the UCSD Draft 2004 LRDP and Environmental Impact Report (EIR)
Questions and Comments

HOW WILL THE UNIVERSITY RESPOND TO COMMUNITY CONCERNS?

- UCSD desires a positive, productive, responsive relationship with area residents (p. 9). How does UCSD interpret that statement?

AREA RESIDENTS’ ISSUES AND CONCERNS:

- University-affiliated encroachment (activities and/or facilities) into adjacent single-family residential zoned neighborhoods.

- Future Redevelopment Area? It has been rumored that UCSD, in conjunction with the City of San Diego, may declare eminent domain in the single-family residential areas adjacent to the university in a similar manner as to what was done at SDSU. The neighborhood would like assurances in writing that such a threat will not be actualized.

- Residents in the single-family residential zoned Highlands/Heights neighborhood adjacent to UCSD are currently facing a precedent-setting encroachment by a UCSD-affiliated student organization using a home as office space, and for advertised conference use in violation of the City’s code compliance regulations.

- University’s responsibility to meet the needs of its student population and the wider campus community with regard to its expansion efforts. Ensure that facilities are properly sited in areas where the zoning is appropriate for institutional and/or mixed use. Adjacent Mixed Use areas include the urban nodes at La Jolla Village Square and University Town Center, not the residential communities.

- Coordination of UCSD’s LRDP with the La Jolla Community Plan and the University City Plan, recognizing the huge impact that the University’s current pressures and future expansion will have on the surrounding communities. Environmental concerns include increased traffic, parking on residential streets, pedestrian and vehicular traffic flow, health and safety issues, infrastructure issues, housing, student-affiliate organizations, theater district expansion, etc. City and University should work together to resolve these issues.

UNIVERSITY’S USE OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY – SITE 675

There is a city-owned property (known as Site 675) shown on the Map (p.5 and p.63, Figure 2 and Figure 11). This property is specifically designated in City documents for
institutional use. What are the University’s plans for this city-owned site? There are already identified student-affiliated needs for institutions which the university legal department has decided should be precluded from placement on the campus proper though an obvious location for such institutional development would be in the UCSD campus Downtown, mentioned on p. 58.

HOTEL/CONFERENCE CENTER

What does it mean (p. 30): that the planned hotel/conference center is primarily for non-university use? Will it be used as a center for university-related conferences or campus business visitors, for instance? What is the rationale for not including it in the 2004 LRDP traffic, pedestrian, population, land use discussions? How can the community get a realistic picture of future development in this area if large facilities are simply omitted from the plan?

CAMPUS POPULATION FIGURES

Numbers diffused throughout this draft LRDP, when viewed collectively are significant.
--p. 24: SIO Birch Aquarium: 350,000 per year. Are those figures included in the LRDP EIR?
--p. 45: “a number of other people on campus” is a rather nebulous description. Is it true that in addition to the projected total campus regulars (students, staff, faculty), projected as 49,000, there are in addition currently 37,700 visitors, projected to 59,000? Are those counted in the parking, traffic, and other EIR issues?
--What about the many current summer camps, both day use and residential? Added to other population figures?
--Are there projected dorm rentals to city visitors and for summer intensives on campus, as offered by other universities in the summer, but not currently mentioned here?

HOUSING FIGURES

Perhaps UCSD needs to slow its growth until it can provide accommodation, parking, and student-affiliated support for the current student population.

POTENTIAL SHARED USE OF TAX-PAYER FUNDED UNIVERSITY RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

As a responsive university, is there a current reason why the Natatorium, for instance, is closed so much of the time? Is UCSD aware of an additional planned Natatorium at the YMCA not far away? Could community residents use the UCSD natatorium during off-peak hours to prevent use of sparse community land for a redundant facility?
--Other universities provide community use passes for pool use during off-peak hours at reasonable single use and pack of ten rates (e.g. $30 for 10 visits to the pool). Is there any chance of such shared use?