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REVISED NOTICE OF PREPARATION – ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Project Title: 2004 Long Range Development Plan
Sch. Number: 2003081023
Lead Agency: University of California
Project Location: University of California, San Diego
County: San Diego

Background

The University of California, San Diego (UCSD) Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed for public review on August 1, 2003. This NOP indicated that UCSD, as the lead agency for the LRDP EIR, would be preparing a program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) addressing an update to the existing 1989 LRDP. The LRDP update would provide planning direction for future development through the year 2020. Since that time, three specific development projects have been identified that will also be included in the LRDP EIR. These specific development projects are known as:

1. Hopkins Parking Garage
2. Supercomputer Center Expansion
3. School of Management

Because these development projects will also be included in the LRDP EIR, and were not previously identified in the LRDP EIR NOP, this NOP has been distributed to solicit input regarding environmental issues that should be addressed in the LRDP EIR relative to each of these specific projects. Within the LRDP EIR, a Project Specific Analysis will be provided for each project. The following provides a brief project description for each of these specific projects.
**Project Descriptions**

**Hopkins Parking Garage.** The Hopkins Parking Garage is proposed adjacent and east of Social Sciences Building, southeast of the existing Supercomputer Center, south of Rimac, north of the Thurgood Marshall College Apartments and Voigt Lane, and west of Hopkins Drive in the north/central part of the West campus. The parking structure is anticipated to be set into the existing topography such that approximately half of the structure would be beneath the ground surface. Ingress and egress into the structure will be from two entrances: one would be located on Hopkins Drive, while the other would be located on Voigt Lane. The parking structure would be a multi-level facility that would provide approximately 1,400 parking stalls.

**Supercomputer Center Expansion.** The Supercomputer Center Expansion is proposed adjacent and east of the existing Supercomputer Center, which is located between Ridge Walk and Hopkins Drive in the north/central part of the West campus. The proposed expansion would be situated where an existing parking lot (P354) is now located. The existing parking lot would be vacated to allow for construction of the Supercomputer Center Expansion. The expansion would be comprised of approximately 80,000 gross square feet (GSF) with most of the expansion allocated to office space and approximately fifteen percent of the space provided for expansion of the existing computer room.

**School of Management.** The School of Management buildings are proposed on a triangular shaped site north of the northeast part of Eleanor Roosevelt College in the northwest portion of the West campus. The site is adjacent to Ridge Walk on its eastern boundary, with the northwest corner of the site adjacent to Scholars Drive North. The southwest boundary would be adjacent to the future Wedge open space area. The site would gain access from Scholars Drive North. The proposed development of buildings would be phased such that the first phase would consist of 85,000 GSF, with future phases adding approximately 115,000 for a total of up 200,000 GSF. The buildings would provide facilities for faculty, staff and students.

**LRDP EIR**

The issues to be addressed in the LRDP EIR concerning these projects will be the same as those identified in the July 2003 Initial Study that was prepared for the 2004 LRDP in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the CEQA Guidelines, and the University of California Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, and was circulated with the firstNOP prepared in August 2003. 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 impacts on agricultural and mineral resources. The 2004 LRDP EIR will also include analysis of project alternatives. Any comments previously provided in response to the August NOP will be considered in the preparation of the 2004 LRDP EIR.
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 projects. As Lead Agency we need to know the views of your agency’s statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed projects, in particular the Hopkins Parking Garage, Supercomputer Center Expansion and School of Management. Comments previously sent in response to the August 2003 NOP for the 2004 LRDP will be considered and do not necessarily need to be reiterated in response to this NOP.

We appreciate your prompt acknowledgement and review of this NOP. Due to the time limits mandated by state law, the 30-day comment period will extend from December 8, 2003 to January 6, 2004. Your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but not later than 5:00 p.m. on January 6, 2004. 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 6:00 p.m. Thursday, December 18, 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, the location of the scoping meeting and parking is 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,

Jeffrey A. Steindorf  
Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Campus Planning

Enclosure: Environmental Document Transmittal Form  
Project Location Map

cc: H. Schmeltzer  
J. Zimmerman
Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal
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MR. PHEGLEY: Okay. Good evening. I'm Milt Phegley, the Campus Community Planner at UCSD. I'd like to welcome you to this scoping meeting for the Revised Notice of Preparation for the Long-Range Development Plan for UCSD. We had a previous scoping meeting in August on the Long-Range Development Plan itself. This scoping meeting this evening is necessitated by a change in the scope of the Long-Range Development Plan/EIR. We'll talk more about that as we go through the presentation.

But what I did want to indicate is that any comments that were made at the previous scoping meeting or made in writing during the Notice of Preparation process, those comments are being carried forward into this revised Environmental Impact Report. So anything that was said before, you don't need to repeat. If you have anything additional on the Long-Range Development Plan itself, you can make comments in that regard this evening. But what we would like to do is, as much as possible, focus on the three specific projects that are the subject of this Revised Notice of Preparation.

What we're going to do is briefly review the LRDP process, talk about the Long-Range Development Plan, review what the Long-Range Development Plan is, discuss the concept
of tiering and environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act, identify environmental issues that will be addressed with regard to these three specific projects and go into some detail on each of the individual projects, and then take public comment.

This is the process chart that we have previously presented with regard to the Long-Range Development Plan and the Environmental Impact Report. You'll notice the changes to it from the last time that it was presented is that we have both a scoping meeting that was held in August on the LRDP, and now we have a scoping meeting being held in December on the three individual projects. The time frame for the public review and comment on the LRDP and the EIR has been changed by a couple months. It's now expected to occur no earlier than April of 2004. Our target date of reaching the Board of Regents for their review and certification of the documents previously was July, and now we're looking at the August/September time frame.

I think most of you are familiar with the concept of the Long-Range Development Plan. What the LRDP is intended to be is a land use plan and capacity analysis for the campus, and serve as a document to provide a framework for future campus development, as well as information for the campus and the community regarding land use decisions and the impacts of those decisions.
What the LRDP generally does not provide is a detailed plan for campus development or any specific information on specific buildings that would be built in the future. This revised LRDP/EIR is the result of three projects that were initially anticipated to be handled after the certification of the LRDP/EIR. But it's been judged they are sufficiently important to go forward without delay that we are revising the scope of the Long-Range Development Plan/EIR to include these three specific projects:

The Hopkins Parking Structure is believed to be necessary in order to assure an adequate supply of parking. The Supercomputer expansion is in response to program growth of that activity. And the Management School is to provide for space for a new academic program.

We need to have the environmental review completed on these three projects before we're able to proceed to additional actions on the projects, such as the final design and approval of the projects themselves by the Regents, and then being able to advertise for our bids on the projects, and actually being able to construct the project. Because our existing LRDP/EIR, the 1989 plan, has basically reached the end of its usefulness, we're unable to use it as a base document to do additional environmental review on specific projects. So we're unable to tier from that EIR for specific projects.
As a result, if we were not to incorporate these projects into the EIR, then there would be an additional delay of four to six months after the completion of the LRDP/EIR for us to be able to do the environmental review on the individual projects. But by incorporating them into the EIR, we're able to get that time savings, and consequently, the LRDP/EIR schedule has been modified to accommodate these individual projects.

The schedule modification provides the additional time that's necessary for the analysis of the projects, as well as their relationship to the LRDP. Basically, what we are doing is concurrently tiering these projects with the LRDP, whereas on future projects, we would do subsequent tiering, in that you would have the LRDP/EIR as the program document, and then do the environmental analysis for the individual projects in relationship to that program document.

In the preparation of the EIR, both for the Long-Range Development Plan and for these individual projects, we go through a process of identifying environmental issues, assessing impacts, considering mitigation measures, providing response to public comments, and then, finally, development of a mitigation, monitoring and reporting program. All of these steps would be done for these three individual projects.
The issue categories that are contained within CEQA and that would be applied to these three individual projects are the same as we previously identified for the LRDP/EIR, but each of these categories would be looked at for the individual project, either for the project alone or in the context of the LRDP. So the three projects that are to be included in the LRDP are, as I said, the Hopkins Parking Structure, the Supercomputer Center expansion and the Graduate School of Management.

To identify the components of these individual projects and talk about the initial environmental review on them, Cathy Presmyk from the Physical Planning Office, the Campus's Environmental Planner, will be presenting information, and then she also will be assisted by Devon Muto from PBS&J, who is our environmental consultant for the Long-Range Development Plan/EIR.

MS. PRESMYK: Thank you, Milt.

As Milt said, these three projects will be tiered from and attached to the 2004 Long-Range Development Plan. Site selection processes have already been completed, and project architects are on board. As the architects begin design, this, then, is the appropriate time to do the environmental review for these projects in conjunction with the Long-Range Development Plan/EIR.

All three of these projects are located in the
north campus. The Management School is located east of Scholars Drive. The San Diego Supercomputer and the Hopkins Parking Structure are located adjacent to one another just west of Hopkins Drive. Specifically, the Hopkins Parking Structure is flanked by Voigt Lane on the south, RIMAC is located to the north, and we are due east of Social Sciences and the San Diego Supercomputer Center.

These pictures depict the future location of the parking structure. The top photo is looking westward from Hopkins Drive toward Social Sciences and the Supercomputer facility. The lower photo is actually a view looking the opposite way, towards the east. You can see the grassy area. That's where the parking structure would be located. And you can see our park grove reserve beyond to the east.

The Hopkins Parking Structure will be approximately 1400 spaces. We anticipate at least two, if not three, entrances and exits. Obviously, that still needs to be studied. And we will take advantage of the topography. When looking at the structure, you would see five levels above grade from Hopkins Drive, but you would only see two full levels at the east end of the site because of the change in grade. We'll have approximately 1,000 square feet of retail space included on the ground level. This will be campus-serving retail. The specific retail use has not been identified yet. That's being studied. The total site area
is approximately 2.2 acres. We will have generous landscape
setbacks and buffers along both Voigt Lane and Hopkins
Drive, 30 and 40 feet, respectively.

This project is anticipated to cost approximately
13.2 million. These are non-state dollars. Parking is
self-supporting at UCSD. Construction is anticipated to
begin in the late fall, early winter of 2004. I believe
there was an error in your handout. It may say summer
2004. That is not accurate. It will be much later in the
year. Construction we hope to be completed by summer 2006.

I'm going to let Devon speak to the environmental
issues.

MR. MUTO: Thank you, Cathy.

Milt kind of gave you an introduction to how
we're going to deal with these three projects. Basically,
they're going to be brought into the LRDP/EIR and addressed
almost as three additional EIRs that are tiered off of that
EIR. For each of these three projects, they are going to be
subject to the California Environmental Quality Act and all
of the applicable regulations that are in there. As Milt
mentioned, he identified a number of issues that we had
previously identified for the LRDP/EIR that are going to be
addressed for all of these three projects.

What you see on this slide right here is a few of
the key environmental issues that we identified that we
thought were worth noting that there's definitely going to be some additional analysis on. Just to walk you through those a little bit, traffic and circulation -- of course, putting the parking structure in the campus has the potential to change circulation patterns. So we'll be looking at that. There's lighting associated with the parking, as well as the cars that are going to be parking in the parking structure. So that's another issue. Noise is also an issue associated with a parking structure, of course, because there's vehicles there, and they result in noise. There is residential areas next to where the parking structure is going to be located, so we'll be looking at those impacts.

I think it's probably worth noting that, even though these are on-campus uses that are adjacent to the parking structure, that we're going to be looking at them in equal detail, as opposed to if they were off-campus uses. That doesn't make these impacts less important. I just mention the adjacent residential uses that we're going to be looking at, potential impacts to those.

View corridors. The parking structure is located near the Ridge Walk, as well as the UCSD Park. So we'll be looking at potential impacts to view corridors associated with both of those. Connected with view corridors or visual aesthetics is always landscaping. So that's another issue.
Pedestrian circulation and shuttle connections are also going to be an important part of this project because of its impact to those elements, as well.

So I'll turn it back over to Cathy.

MS. PRESMYK: The San Diego Supercomputer expansion will be located just north of the parking structure we were discussing on an existing parking lot, and you can see RIMAC to the north and Hopkins Drive to the west. Obviously, to be an expansion or addition, it needs to be next to the original structure. So the choices for siting were somewhat limited.

These photos give you an idea of what the site looks like now. The top photo is a Parking Lot 354, and the addition will be located in that parking lot. So we're looking -- in this case, we're looking westward from Hopkins towards the existing Supercomputer Center. You can see the big dish up on the roof there. That's the Supercomputer Center. And then down below, we're looking from the parking lot that will be displaced out towards Hopkins Drive and our grove reserve. That's an eastward-looking view.

The existing Supercomputer Center is approximately 79,000 gross square feet. So we will be doubling the size of the existing facility to accommodate the new program that Milt mentioned by about 80,000 gross square feet. So it'll be about 160- when we're done. The
expansion site is about just under two acres in size. We will be providing for an enlarged computer room, which is sort of the heart and soul of this facility, additional conference room, office space, classrooms, and an auditorium will be added, as well.

When you are standing on Hopkins Drive, you will see five full levels. But like the parking structure, we're going to work with the grades. And so the building will be less prominent when you get further east. However, it's important to note that we will not be building an addition that's any bigger than any of the existing structures that are out there now.

As I mentioned, the parking lot is the home for the addition. So we will be displacing approximately 130 spaces.

We will be continuing the landscape buffer that I mentioned with Hopkins along the west side of the site. It will be 40 feet wide, as well. This is, I believe, one of our first projects to be planned for a LEED Silver Certification.

This project will be built with approximately $20 million of non-state funds. We hope construction will begin in spring 2005, with completion in winter of 2006.

Devon.

MR. MUTU: Thank you once again.
Once again, we've identified the key issues that we identified for this project. As with the other projects, we're going to be analyzing all the projects that are required under CEQA. This is just a short list of some of the key issues that we've identified.

Noise has been identified. Noise can both impact a project like this -- and we'll be looking at that -- but this project can also result in noise potentially associated with uses or generators or such. So we'll also be analyzing that.

Similar to the Hopkins Parking Structure, we're located near Ridge Walk and the park, and so we have the similar concerns with aesthetics, view corridors and landscaping. And so we'll be looking at those, as well.

In addition, how this project fits into the pedestrian circulation of the area.

And then, lastly, energy usage -- any development that requires or has people working in it or classrooms or such has energy requirements. We will be taking those into consideration. As Cathy had mentioned, this development is targeted to be a LEED Silver Certification, which means that it will have substantial energy savings. We're also going to be taking that into account with this project.

MS. PRESMYK: Our third project is the Graduate School of Management. This project is located immediately
adjacent to Ridge Walk. In fact, there will be access off Ridge Walk into the facility. We're north of the Eleanor Roosevelt College, the new housing development we just recently completed, and an open space area that we call "the wedge." It's not developed yet, but it will be.

Scholars Drive is located to the west. The project will take access off Scholars. And then you can see RIMAC down there kind of in the corner to the south and the east.

These photos are westward looking. The top photo is basically -- I'm sorry -- in the foreground is the project site. And then we're looking out towards Salk Institute. You can't see North Torrey Pines Road because it's below the grade of the site. The southern -- or the lower photo on the screen is actually looking down this future green open space area we call "the wedge." The trailers you see off to the right are actually construction trailers from ERC. They'll be removed. In this particular photo, I wanted to point out the ocean views. Those will be retained. In fact, the wedge will be developed in phases as the projects adjacent to it are developed, ERC taking a piece, the Management School will take a piece, and other projects will take a piece, until we finally get the whole thing developed as a green open space buffer between the neighborhoods.
The Management School actually has some instructional programs operating as of this fall. They opened their doors for executive education and leadership courses, and they're operating out of Building 112 in University Center.

The permanent facility's going to be developed in two phases. The first phase is approximately 85,000 gross square feet in size. That 85,000 gross square foot project will be the focus of the analysis in the EIR that we do for this project, because the second phase, which is estimated to be about 115,000 gross square feet, and would be north of the first phase, is not funded, and we have no program or architects to work on it at this time. At some point in the future when money's available, we will come back and do subsequent environmental review for that. But in this document, we will focus on the first phase and lay out broad parameters for the second phase.

The project site is just under two acres. We anticipate that you would see four-story buildings from Scholars Drive, three stories off of Ridge Walk, once again, because of the grade changes. To develop the project, we will be displacing approximately 165 parking spaces from Lot 351.

This is also a non-state project. It's estimated to be about $30 million to build, and that's just the first
phase. We are planning to build this project for LEEDS Bronze Certification. Phase one construction begins winter 2004, with completion in fall of 2006. And as I mentioned before, the wedge is going to be developed incrementally as we develop projects along its borders.

MR. MUTO: Well, pretty much it's the same story that I just told you for the Supercomputer that's for the Graduate School of Management. We're going to be looking at all the issues, of course, required by CEQA. We've once again identified some of the key issues, which are the same that we had for the Supercomputer. But of note, these are, of course, going to be analyzed with regards to site-specific and project-specific issues. And with regards to aesthetics, view corridors and landscaping, the view corridors that are going to be of particular concern are going to be those going the opposite direction from the Ridge Walk because of the location with this project compared to the Supercomputer. That's really all I think I need to point out on this slide.

And then to wrap up, as Cathy had mentioned, there's going to be spaces removed with these projects, as well as added, and this was just to give you a quick summary of all those together. And as you see, there will be a net increase in parking spaces as a result of these three projects. Really, the development of surface parking on
UCSD has been the plan for development into the future. Having surface parking lots within the interior of a developed area is somewhat of an inefficient use of space. So the future development is consistent with the plans for UCSD.

With that, I'm going to turn it back over to Milt to wrap up.

MR. PHEGLEY: Thank you. To again review the process, we're at the Notice of Preparation scoping meeting phase here, focusing on three specific projects that will be included in the Long-Range Development Plan/EIR. The comments that are provided here in this scoping meeting and written comments in response to the Notice of Preparation will be considered during the preparation of the Environmental Impact Report. Both any written and oral comments will become part of the official record for the Environmental Impact Report. So when you see the Draft Environmental Impact Report, all of the written and oral comments will be contained within that document. Anybody who participates in this process will receive notice of the availability of the Environmental Impact Report.

For purposes of our revised Notice of Preparation and scoping process here, the comment deadline is January 6th of next year, 2004. Written comments can be provided on the forms which are available on the table by the door. You
can fill out those forms and turn them in this evening, or if you want to take them and then send your comments to the address that's provided on the form, you can do that. We'll also be taking oral comments this evening with regard to the scoping process.

I would ask that, as we discussed before, you try to direct your comments to these three specific projects, unless you have comments related to the LRDP in general that have not been covered before. And also, because we are tape recording this meeting and producing a transcript from the meeting, if you could come to the microphone if you have anything to say. That way, we can make sure we get it recorded correctly.

The address that's provided here, the web address, is in your handout. All of the material that we've presented this evening in terms of the Notice of Preparation, project description, that sort of thing, is available on the website, as well as the Draft Long-Range Development Plan. The entire text of that is available on the website also.

So with that, we'll open the floor to anyone who has any comments that they would like to -- oral comments they'd like to put on the record.

MS. MOORE: Susan Moore. I did comment at the first scoping meeting, and I did submit a facsimile to -- I
believe to Ms. Presmyk last time.

When I came here tonight, I had absolutely no preconceptions about what was going to be presented. But I find I have to record that my gut reaction to seeing probably barely a blade of grass left on this campus is becoming a travesty. I also note in your CEQA recommendations you're not considering air quality, pollution and emissions. I think they're very important, and I'm not seeing the cumulative impact on health of the parking structures of air quality, and of pollution in particular. I think it's of real concern.

A serious question is, has the City of San Diego received notice for the additional three projects? Have they already made an analysis, and have they put those into the SANDAG projections for LRDP of 2020? If so, could we have some kind of time line and information as to who in fact has received those at the City of San Diego? Because they always deny the fact that UCSD has provided LRDP information on traffic. It's becoming a big issue in this neighborhood.

Second comment, again, is where will the faculty, students and staff for the Graduate School of Management be housed? Where will the children go to school? What recreation facilities will they be provided with? Again, why isn't UCSD looking outside of this campus area to
provide desperately needed infrastructure in other areas of the city, especially in the South Bay and border regions? The School of Management could've been quite easily located in far more -- I think areas of San Diego that are much more conducive to it than this particular location.

Finally, it has to be asked whether or not UCSD has considered where Sixth College and Seventh College are going to be. I understand that Sixth College was originally supposed to be in the area that the School of Management has now gone into temporarily. The residents are concerned because we have no idea where Sixth College will be, where the students will be housed, what recreation facilities they'll be provided with. And exactly the same with Seventh College. As you know, our local neighborhood is already a UCSD parking lot, skateboarding lot, and usually trash lot in the median. The student facilities already encroach into residential areas, as opposed to the original university plan. We would like to have that addressed.

Thank you very much.

MR. PHEGLEY: Thank you. Next.

MS. BOURK: I'm Penelope Bourk. I also responded to the previous Long-Range Development Plan.

My first point is just timing. At the mid August meeting, many people were on vacation. Here we are, December the 18th, clearly not a huge busy time on campus.
It would really sort of bolster our sense that the university is cooperating with the calendar of when people are available if the hearings weren't when people weren't basically on campus. It would just be a good faith sort of offer. Perhaps you've had all kinds of meetings with students and other faculty and staff on campus for the Long-Range Development Plan. But if not, you know, many of them have left by this point.

My second point is, I notice that these -- the parking lots seem to be -- this is the second parking lot that will be built right beside a dorm -- why all the parking that is being removed is one story, basically, about 130 parking spaces that I think the Supercomputer is going to go on -- it's going to increase by a factor of ten, because you're going to -- where there were 130 cars parked, very close to that, there are now going to be 1400 cars parked. The traffic, the noise, the alarms -- I don't know if -- I had the mixed blessing living in a college dorm last summer. The number of alarms that go off in parking lots are quite stunning in the night. So I just am a little bit concerned. This is the second one you'll place right beside dorms. And the emissions for when you increase the parking in that area by a factor of ten would seem to be considerable.

I wonder if you've given any thought to putting
the parking lots a little bit closer to the perimeter of campus, and encouraging a bit of walking, rather than putting it right beside the dorms. You know, obviously, students need some room to unpack and pack and bring a few things. But to have larger parking available elsewhere would seem useful.

Another question -- I mean, Sue Moore mentioned that we're having overflow into our neighborhood. You perhaps know that the Hillel organization has taken over a home in our neighborhood, and also is trying to build a student center -- a 10,000 square foot student center on what is a designated open space, and has lobbied for four years against all sort of reasonable purpose to do that. I understand that facilities like Hillel, which have a religious purpose, are not allowed to, according to a UCSD legal interpretation, be on campus. But I noticed in the UC Plan, the University Community Plan, that the suggestion was made that on the tops of buildings there be put communal areas. I wondered if you'd given any thought to putting some kind of communal areas on top of the parking structures. And I wondered if it was five layers off the ground, could some of these student religious organizations that really need a place, for instance, be located sort of from a sky-hook, and so somehow permitted to be on -- I mean, it's a stretch, but the alternative is that our
neighborhood will be taken over bit by bit as the university
doubles, and as the needs become more and more apparent for
the off-campus affiliated needs of UCSD.

My third concern is about the placement of the
School of Management. It looks to me as if phase one, the
way it's skewed -- and I may -- this is the first time I've
really seen the orientation on the slide -- but it looks as
if it's going to be almost -- the corner of it -- the south
corner of it is going to be almost contiguous with Eleanor
Roosevelt College. And I don't know if you ever walk along
Ridge Walk, but it is absolutely stunning. And if this
continuation of blockages goes, you will have a tunnel there
instead of one of the most beautiful views in San Diego,
where you can see the ocean and you can see to the
mountains. The idea that somehow it's being turned into a
tunnel with no view corridors, the way that building is
slanted, is a serious concern to me, because it is sort
of -- kind of a national treasure. That's really an unusual
place, Ridge Walk.

My fifth point is I don't know what a LEED Bronze
Certificate is. Maybe when I'm done, you could explain
that.

And I did wonder if there had been any discussion
with students, whether students on the campus have any
input. You know, a student point of view, even in the Long-
Term Development Plan, might be useful.

So thank you.

MR. PHEGLEY: Thank you. Next.

MS. COAKLEY: Mary Coakley. My question would be towards the use perhaps of the top of the parking structures. Penny referred to some communal meeting area. But I understand in many areas throughout the United States they're using those for playing fields. Since I am employed by the Nomads, and I'm well aware of -- throughout the whole City of San Diego and the county the desperate need for playing fields -- Lacrosse has become quite a viable entity, and everyone is desperate for fields. With Park and Rec. being cut back so badly in their funding -- we just held a Thanksgiving tournament with over 5200 participants from all over the United States and outside the country, and had 48 different venues where we were holding, you know, tournament matches. It's -- Surf Cup is held on 20 fields or 22 fields up in Del Mar. It looks like perhaps the city is going to quash that use. So that will be a desperate -- a devastation to the community. I just was wondering if any consideration had been given to the viability of turning that into playing fields of one sort or another, since the students, as well, on campus are in much need of exercise. So I'd like to know what your thinking is on that.

MR. PHEGLEY: Okay. Thank you.
Anyone else?

MS. COYLE: Good evening. I'm Courtney Coyle, and I represent the La Jolla Farms Homeowners. I'll be following up with a brief letter to comment on the recirculated notice.

I just have two comments on the School of Management piece, which is a new piece to the plan. My first is that we have some concerns that this may limit the potential opportunities to have partnerships with the Walk Institute in an area that's proximate to Salk. What kind of opportunities am I talking about? These would be recreation, day care, other potentials for shared uses and facilities away from the environmentally sensitive areas that are owned by both Salk and UCSD campus.

My second concern, which was addressed a little bit earlier, has to do with the locations of the other schools that may be coming, and if this was going to displace that use from there. We're kind of concerned about what other types of impacts this may have and where those other schools may then be located, and whether they'd be located closer to the coastal mesas, because that might pose a concern to the homeowners.

So I'll follow up with a letter, and thank you.

MR. PHEGLEY: Thank you.

Any additional comments?
MS. COAKLEY: Public speaking is not my forté.
Mary Coakley again.

What I intended to go to with the budget cuts in Park and Rec. is the fact that in previous years we've been able to use many of the fields that they have at parks. But because they've cut their budget so significantly, many of the fields were in such bad condition we were unable to use them, which meant that we had to switch to much more costly venues, and which means for future areas for any kind of sports activities, we can look for an increasing number of unusable facilities.

MR. PHEGLEY: Okay.

MS. BOURK: Penelope Bourk again.

One of the things that I meant to comment on as I watched the new theater go up like a fortress on La Jolla Village Drive is that, even though I suggested that perhaps parking structures further from student dorms and closer to the periphery might be good, I hope that the university does not, as it did in the parking structure on North Torrey Pines and Eleanor Roosevelt, practically built out to the road. In the University Community Plan, it does talk about how, at least on the east part of the campus, where of course there's nothing now, there should be some sense that the university blends into the community. Here, the buildings in the last few years along North Torrey Pines,
are truly stunning in the fortress-like quality that they provide.

I see that the School of Management seems to be intended to be set back. But it really makes a difference to how the university intimates its connection to the surround if it's not a walled fortress. So I hope you'll keep that in mind in your whole long-term planning, because if you're going to do sort of the fortress approach, you might do it perhaps where there aren't so many residences.

For instance, Black Horse Farms and all the way down toward the south it's very residential. Those huge walls going up really make a difference. However, at the far end of the campus, where you're really in business areas anyway, it might be more prudent to do some of that development up there, because it's really almost -- it's a front, and it is affronting. It's changing -- you know, by just yielding even 15 feet with some landscaping, you could make a great big difference to the periphery of the campus. And again, the view corridors from out of the campus and into the campus would enhance the sense that there's some kind of currency between the surrounding areas.

Thanks.

MR. PHEGLEY: Thank you. If there are no additional comments, then we'll close this scoping meeting. What we'll do, as we are doing with comments that were
provided at the August scoping meeting, is if there's information which can be readily provided to answer questions that you have, we will be providing a response to you regarding that as soon as possible. And then any other comments that you've made, we'll be making sure that they are addressed in the Environmental Impact Report.

So if there's no other comments or questions, the meeting is closed. Thank you.

(Meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.)
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- California Department of Toxic Substances Control, School Property Evaluation and Cleanup Division, Ken Chiang, Senior Hazardous Substances Scientist
- San Diego’s Regional Planning Agency, Mario R. Oropeza, Project Manager
- San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc., Environmental Review Committee, James W. Royle, Jr., Chairperson
- Native American Heritage Commission, Carol Gaubatz, Program Analyst, December 23, 2003
- Native American Heritage Commission, Carol Gaubatz, Program Analyst, December 17, 2003
- TransitNow, Michael Duffy, President
- Gail Forbes
- Courtney Ann Coyle, Esq.
- Penelope Bourk
January 6, 2004

Ms. Catherine Presmyk
University of California
(Physical Planning Office, UCSD)
La Jolla, California 92093

NOTICE OF PREPARATION FOR UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, 2004 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, GILMAN DRIVE AND LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE, LA JOLLA, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA (SCH 2003081023)

Dear Ms. Presmyk:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has reviewed the Notice of Preparation (NOP), dated December 8, 2003, for the subject project. The due date to submit comments is January 6, 2004.

Based on a review of the NOP, DTSC is providing the following comments:

1. Because the project is school site related, DTSC recommends that an environmental review, such as Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I) and/or Preliminary Endangerment Assessment (PEA), be conducted to determine whether there has been or may have been a release or threatened release of a hazardous material, or whether a naturally occurring hazardous material is present, based on reasonably available information about the property and the area in its vicinity.

2. University of California, San Diego (UCSD) is invited to participate in DTSC's School Property Evaluation and Cleanup Program authorized by AB 387, SB162, AB 2644 and AB 972. If UCSD elects to proceed to conduct a PEA at the site, it shall enter into an Environmental Oversight Agreement (EOA) with DTSC to oversee the preparation of the PEA.
Ms. Catherine Presmyk  
January 6, 2004  
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DTSC is also administering the $85 million Cleanup Loans and Environmental Assistance to Neighborhoods (CLEAN) Program which provides low-interest loans to investigate and cleanup hazardous materials at properties where redevelopment is likely to have a beneficial impact to a community. These loans are available to developers, businesses, schools, and local governments.

For additional information on the EOA or CLEAN Program, please visit DTSC’s web site at www.dtsc.ca.gov. If you would like to meet and discuss this matter further, please contact me at (818) 551-2860.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ken Chiang  
Senior Hazardous Substances Scientist  
School Property Evaluation and Cleanup Division

cc: Mr. Michael O’Neill  
School Facilities Planning Division  
California Department of Education  
1430 N Street, Suite 3207  
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. Scott Morgan  
State Clearinghouse  
1400 Tenth Street  
P.O. Box 3044  
Sacramento, California 95812-3044

Department of Toxic Substances Control  
CEQA Tracking Center  
1001 I Street, 22nd Floor  
P.O. Box 806  
Sacramento, California 95812-0806
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January 4, 2004

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

RE: NOP – Long Range Development Plan

Dear Mr. Steindorf:

SANDAG would like the opportunity to comment on the above referenced project. As the Congestion Management Agency for the San Diego region, SANDAG is responsible for preparing and coordinating the implementation of a Congestion Management Program (CMP) for the region. One of the requirements of the CMP is that local jurisdictions implement a CMP Land Use Analysis Program requiring enhanced CEQA reviews for large projects. A large project is defined as:

    a project that upon completion would be expected to generate either an equivalent of 2,400 or more average daily vehicle or 200 or more peak-hour trips

Attached for your use are the most current CMP guidelines for implementing the Land Use Analysis Program, including the enhanced CEQA review. SANDAG would request that when preparing the EIR for the above referenced project, that UCSD include the CMP requirements in the EIR scope.

Should you have any questions concerning our request or the CMP, please contact me at (619) 595-5369 or mor@sandag.org. We look forward to reviewing a copy of the draft EIR upon completion.

Sincerely,

MARIO R. OROPEZA  
Project Manager

cc: Shelby Tucker, SANDAG  
MO/JB
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CHAPTER 6: LAND USE ANALYSIS PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that all jurisdictions in the State of California evaluate the potential environmental impacts caused by new development or projects. If impacts are identified, then potential mitigation measures are evaluated and recommended. While cities and the County routinely examine and mitigate impacts to transportation services and facilities within their jurisdiction, this commitment often does not extend to the CMP system (as defined in Chapter 4). State statute highlights the responsibility of local jurisdictions to consider the impact of new development on the CMP system as part of their decision-making process.

The Land Use Analysis Program is an information sharing process that seeks to improve communication between public agencies, private entities and the general public, regarding the impact of new development on the CMP system. It provides a consistent methodology for examining CMP system impacts in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). This will aid local jurisdictions in determining when mitigation is recommended, and what mitigation strategies are most appropriate.

As shown in the diagram below, the focus of this chapter is on strategies to identify and to address future congestion resulting from new development. Existing congestion is addressed through ongoing roadway monitoring and the preparation of Deficiency Plans as described in Chapters 4 (Transportation System Performance Evaluation) and 8 (Deficiency Plan).
LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

The requirements for the land use impact element of the CMP can be found in Section 65089(4) of the State of California Government Code (see Appendix F). Those requirements are paraphrased below.

- Develop a program to analyze the impacts of land use decisions made by local jurisdictions on the CMP system;
- Include an estimate of costs associated with mitigating those impacts;
- To the extent possible, use the Performance Element measures developed (see Chapter 4) to measure impacts to the CMP system;
- Exclude the costs of mitigating the impacts of interregional travel;
- Provide credit for local public and private contributions for improvements to the CMP system; and
- Incorporate the requirements and analysis under CEQA.

Related to the land use program requirements, the CMP statute also requires that SANDAG, in consultation with the cities and the County, develop a uniform database to assess traffic impacts of new development and to incorporate the results in a countywide transportation computer model. SANDAG also is to review and approve transportation computer models of specific areas within the region that will be used by local jurisdictions to determine the quantitative impacts of development on the circulation system. These models are to be based on a countywide model and be consistent with the modeling methodology and the databases used by SANDAG.

ISSUES

Under current CEQA practices, full project mitigation may not always be possible due to a number of reasons, including, but not limited to institutional considerations, infeasible nature of the proposed mitigation measures, or cost. Additionally, a project’s contribution to cumulative traffic impacts on the CMP system may not be mitigated, which over time may result in unacceptable levels of service where no single project is responsible. Finally, local jurisdictions may make a finding of “overriding considerations” and approve a project without mitigating the project impacts. This unmitigated traffic becomes the responsibility of local jurisdictions or through SANDAG’s Regional Transportation Plan. Given these considerations, a better means to maintain the link between new development project impacts and a project sponsor’s mitigation responsibilities needs to be pursued.

As discussed in Chapter 5, Transportation Demand Management, SANDAG is working on a number of programs to define and promote “smart growth” as one means to better integrate land use and transportation decisions and to improve the quality of life in the region. Two of the smart growth strategies being investigated include locating higher development densities near transit stations and encouraging compatible mixed land uses. Whereas these strategies support the goals of smart growth, current CMP enhanced land use analysis’s requirements may discourage these types of development since smart growth developments often generate more peak hour trips within the focus areas than traditional development and thus may require increased project mitigation under the CMP. On the other hand, smart growth has the potential to reduce overall congestion on the larger, regional transportation system.
RECOMMENDED APPROACH

The SANDAG approach in meeting the CMP land use impact element requirements consists of four strategies: enhanced CEQA project review (land use analysis program), project mitigation resources, preparation and dissemination of project design guidelines, and regional modeling consistency. These strategies are further discussed below.

Enhanced CEQA Project Review

An enhanced CEQA review process has been established for use by local jurisdictions and/or project sponsors to conduct traffic impact studies and provide mitigation for new large project impacts on the CMP transportation system. Local agencies are required to adopt and continually implement this enhanced CEQA review process. The key features of this process include:

- A large project is defined as generating, upon its completion, an equivalent of 2,400 or more average daily vehicle trips or 200 or more peak-hour vehicle trips.
- The review is to include a traffic impact analysis (Traffic Impact Study - TIS) and mitigation for project impacts to the regional transportation system. Updated Traffic Impact Study guidelines have prepared and are incorporated into this update (refer to Appendix D).
- The traffic impact analysis must identify the project’s impacts on the CMP transportation system, their associated costs, and appropriate mitigation.
- Early project coordination with affected public agencies and transportation operators is required.
- Local agencies are to coordinate with NCTD and/or MTDB to ensure that transit operators evaluate the impact of new development on CMP transit performance measures.

State regulation requires that all environmental documents prepared for projects in the San Diego region be submitted to the State Clearinghouse, and the State Clearinghouse in turn advises SANDAG of documents it has received. In many instances projects sponsors also send a copy of environmental documents directly to SANDAG. Under its regional intergovernmental review program, SANDAG reviews and comments on environmental documents submitted by various agencies. As part of that process, the documents are reviewed to ensure that the enhanced CEQA review process is followed for large projects, and the results of the required traffic analyses and identified mitigation measures are adequate. Comments, when appropriate, are submitted to the lead agency for the environmental review.

2002 CMP Update Changes

The following changes in the Enhanced CEQA Project Review process are incorporated into this update.

Updated Traffic Impact Studies Guidelines - As noted earlier, updated Traffic Impact Studies (TIS) guidelines have been incorporated into the CMP (Appendix D). These guidelines were prepared jointly by the San Diego Traffic Engineer Council (SANTEC) and the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITS – California Border Section) in 2000.

Project Mitigation Resources

Resources currently available to mitigate the impacts of new development include specific project mitigation negotiated between the project sponsor and local jurisdictions, local agency funding, and regional funding made available through the Regional Transportation Improvement Program process. Additional new resources and strategies identified this CMP update are discussed below.
2002 CMP Update Changes

The following changes in project mitigation resources are incorporated into this update.

**Promote TDM Project Mitigation Strategies:** Develop and disseminate information on alternative transportation strategies for local agency and private developer use in mitigating the impacts of development activity. This information would be based upon the “Toolbox of Mitigation Strategies” and “Model TDM Program/Ordinance” referenced in Chapter 5, Transportation Demand Management. These strategies also could be used in preparing Deficiency Plans (see Chapter 8).

**Ensure Appropriate Mitigation of Significant Project Impacts:** It is the goal of the CMP to ensure appropriate mitigation of significant new large project impacts on the CMP system through use of congestion management strategies (CMP roadway or transit improvements and/or non-traditional approaches, such as Transportation Demand Management) contained within the CMP, including specific strategies identified in adopted Deficiency Plans. For the purpose of meeting CMP requirements, these guidelines do not apply to mitigation which would necessitate construction of freeway improvements, including interchanges until such time that Deficiency Plans have been prepared and adopted identifying specific improvements necessary to bring the freeway segments into conformance with the CMP LOS standard. Mitigation of project impacts may include demand management strategies and/or fair share contributions toward future improvements to be identified with the Deficiency Plan. The Deficiency Plans will identify potential funding sources to implement the recommended improvements including, but not limited to federal, state, local, and private funding sources. The preceding restriction regarding freeway improvements applies only to the CMP project review process and is not intended to limit a local jurisdiction's responsibility under CEQA for ongoing review and mitigation for projects that would impact freeways.

The following guidelines are provided to assist in meeting this goal.

**New Large Project** – A new development project generating, upon its completion, an equivalent of 2,400 or more new average daily vehicle trips, or 200 or more new peak-hour vehicle trips.

**Significant Impacts** – An increase in traffic on the CMP system generated by the project that exceeds the standards summarized below which are provided in the Traffic Impact Studies Guidelines (See Table D-1 in Appendix D for a further explanation on how to use these standards).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service with Project</th>
<th>Allowable Change due to Project Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freeways '</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V/C Speed (mph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D, E, &amp; F (or ramp meter delays above 15 min.)</td>
<td>0.01 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'These guidelines apply only to freeways with adopted Deficiency Plans.

**Project Mitigation** – Actions necessary to reduce the project impacts on the CMP system below to or below the standards summarized above and provided in the Traffic Impact Studies Guidelines (Table D-1 in Appendix D).
Available Mitigation Measures - Measures available to mitigate project impacts include, but are not limited, to the measures listed below. The best mix of mitigation measures will vary based on the nature of the development project, nearby land uses and densities, and strategy availability.

- Traditional roadway and/or transit improvements
- Transportation Demand Management or Transportation System Management strategies
- Project Design Guidelines (discussed later in this chapter).
- Additional CMP Toolbox of Mitigation Strategies (to be prepared in 2003)
- Model TDM Program/Ordinance (to be prepared in 2003)

Local jurisdictions have sole responsibility for approving any specific mitigation measures, proposed funding, and/or implementation responsibilities resulting from the enhanced CEQA project review process.

Project Design Guidelines

In support of the CMP and other planning activities, project design guidelines to promote alternative travel modes including walking, bicycle, ridesharing, and public transit have been prepared. The available guidelines are listed below and are available for local agency use in mitigating the impacts of new development projects and in preparing CMP Deficiency Plans.

- “Designing for Transit” (Metropolitan Transit Development Board – July 1993)
- “Bikeway Planning and Design – California Highway Design Manual” (Caltrans – February 2001)
- “Regional Transit Vision” (San Diego Association of Governments, Metropolitan Transit Development Board, and North San Diego County Transit Development Board – November 2001)
- “Planning and Designing For Pedestrians” (San Diego Association of Governments – June 2002)

Regional Modeling

When evaluating the traffic impacts of any large project, it is SANDAG’s goal that a common database and comparable traffic forecast models are used to ensure that all projects are evaluated on a uniform basis. This can be accomplished by local jurisdictions use the most current SANDAG regional or subarea traffic forecasting model, or any other local traffic analysis model that has been approved by SANDAG for use in CMP traffic analysis. Local jurisdictions also are required to use SANDAG’s most recent Regional Growth Forecasts as the basic population and land use database.

In addition, local jurisdictions are to provide SANDAG, as part of each Regional Growth Forecast update, information regarding changes to general plan land use designations, major new development approvals, and smaller project information, for use in SANDAG’s cumulative traffic forecast analysis. The information is to be provided in the manner, form, and schedule established as part of the Regional Growth Forecast update and review process for local agency information. This information is used to assess the cumulative impacts of all traffic impact analyses completed to date.
RECOMMENDED FOR FURTHER STUDY

In addition to the CMP changes previously noted, the following actions are recommended for further study and potential incorporation into the CMP at a later date:

**Reexamine Traffic Impact Studies (TIS) Guidelines:** Initiate a study to determine how to incorporate into the TIS guidelines: (1) CMP Performance Element measures; (2) trip generation and distribution rate adjustments for smart growth-supportive land uses; and (3) potential TDM mitigation strategies.

**Evaluate Additional Land Use Analysis Program Modifications:** Reexamine the CMP Land Use Analysis Program requirements in light of the efforts to develop a Regional Comprehensive Plan and changes in smart growth policies and strategies in the San Diego region. This evaluation would look at potential modifications to be consistent with smart growth including, but not limited to:

- Adjustments in trip generation rates;
- Adjustments in criteria for determining significant impacts;
- Alternative procedures for evaluating/mitigating smart growth projects under the CMP Enhanced CEQA Review

IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of the preceding land use analyses program recommendations will be the joint responsibility of several agencies, including SANDAG, cities and County, Caltrans, MTDB, NCTD, and the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (APCD). Their respective responsibilities are summarized below in Table 6-1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 6-1</strong></th>
<th><strong>Land Use Analysis Program Recommendations Responsibilities</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SANDAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced CEQA Review</td>
<td>D / M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated TIS Guidelines</td>
<td>D / M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote TDM Measures</td>
<td>D / M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Mitigation Goal</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Modeling</td>
<td>D / M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Design Guidelines</td>
<td>D / R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Program Modifications</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Including private developers

Key:
- D – Develop Initial Proposals
- R - Review and Comment
- A - Adopt or Implement
- M - Monitor

January, 2003
2002 SANDAG Congestion Management Program
To: Mr. Jeffrey A. Steindorf  
Assistant Vice Chancellor, Campus Planning  
University of California, San Diego  
9500 Gilman Drive, MC 0006  
La Jolla, California 92093-0006

Subject: Revised Notice of Preparation  
2004 Long Range Development Plan

Dear Mr. Steindorf:

The San Diego County Archaeological Society (SDCAS) recently learned of the subject Notice of Preparation and downloaded copies of it, and the August 2003 NOP and initial study, from the UCSD Physical Planning website. We would like to offer the following comments on this NOP and the initial study for consideration in the preparation of the DEIR:

1. Section 5.a of the initial study refers to the 1989 LRDP EIR Cultural Resources Inventory Update (ERCE 1989). We assume that a new update will be prepared to serve as a basis for the treatment of cultural resources in the 2004 LRDP, as a 15 years old evaluation should be considered obsolete. Even the 1998 study of Camp Callan and Camp Matthews may require updating.

2. Also in reference to Section 5.a of the initial study, we commend the University for acknowledging the point that structures on the campus will have to be re-evaluated for historical significance (i.e., eligibility for the California Register and National Register) over the life of the LRDP. This seemingly-obvious point is too often overlooked in initial drafts of community plans, etc. In the case of UCSD and SIO, there are a number of structures that clearly will become candidates for the two Registers. For one, the SIO facility designed by Lloyd Ruocco comes immediately to mind.

3. Section 5.b of the initial study appropriately notes the need to evaluate the potential for individual LRDP projects to impact significant archaeological resources. As you are aware, and as Section 5.b acknowledges, certain portions of the LRDP area are culturally and archaeologically highly sensitive. The “appropriate mitigation measures” mentioned in this section must include curation of the resulting archaeological collections and the associated records in a qualified archaeological repository meeting the standards 36 CFR 79. Compliance with the CFR is a consequence of the University's use of federal funding,
although very similar standards are included in the State Historical Resources Commission’s *Guidelines for the Curation of Archaeological Collections* (1993).

4. Also new since the 1989 LRDP are the federal Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (NAGPRA) and the California NAGPRA of 2001 (CalNAGPRA). Both will need to be addressed in the treatment of any new projects and, as a recipient of federal funding, the University has an existing requirement to ensure that all collections from previous projects are located and evaluated for NAGPRA compliance. This would include collections held by the University as well as those in the custody of companies and other entities that may have received such collections in the past. We believe that the LRDP should include provisions for tracking down the existing collections, conducting the required NAGPRA reviews, upgrading the collections as necessary, and properly curating them.

SDCAS would appreciate the opportunity to review the 2004 LRDP DEIR when it becomes available for public review. To that end, please provide one copy, plus one copy of the cultural resources technical report(s), to us at:

   Environmental Review Committee
   San Diego County Archaeological Society
   P.O. Box 81106
   San Diego, CA 92138-1106

In addition, we would request being included in the public review of individual projects’ environmental documents.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

James W. Royle, Jr., Chairperson
Environmental Review Committee

cc: SDCAS President
    File
December 23, 2003

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

RE: UCSD 2004 Long Range Development Plan: SCH No. 2003061023

Dear Mr. Steindorf,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above mentioned Notice of Preparation. The Commission has already completed a record search of its Sacred Lands File for the project area at the request of Ms. Catherine Presmyk. The record search failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. The absence of specific site information in the Sacred Lands File does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in any project area. Other sources of cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and recorded sites.

To adequately assess the project-related impact on archaeological resources, the Commission recommends the following action be required:

☐ Contact the appropriate Information Center for a records search. The record search will determine:
  • Whether a part or all of the project area has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
  • Whether any known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the project area.
  • Whether the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located within the project area.
  • Whether a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

☐ The final stage of the archaeological inventory survey is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.

☐ Required the report containing site significance and mitigation be submitted immediately to the planning department.

☐ Required site forms and final written report be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the Information Center.

✓ A record search of the Native American Heritage’s Sacred Lands File has failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. However, the absence of specific site information in the sacred lands file does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in any project area.

Enclosed is a list of Native Americans individuals/organizations who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. You may wish to coordinate with Ms. Presmyk in contacting these individuals/organizations. The Commission makes no recommendation or preference of a single individual, or group over another. This list should provide a starting place in locating areas of potential adverse impact within the proposed project area. I suggest you contact all of those indicated, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. A minimum of two weeks must be allowed for responses after notification. If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any these individuals or groups, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information.

Lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude the existence of archeological resources. Lead agencies should include provisions for accidentally discovered archeological resources during construction per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5 (f). Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and Public Resources Code §5097.98 mandates the process to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery and should be included in all environmental documents. If you have any questions, please contact me at (916) 653-6251.

Sincerely,

Carol Gaubatz
Program Analyst

cc: State Clearinghouse
NATIVE AMERICAN CONTACTS
San Diego County
December 23, 2003

Barona Group of the Capitan Grande
Clifford LaChappa, Spokesman
1095 Barona Road
Lakeside, CA 92040
(619) 443-6612/13

Sycuan Band of Mission Indians
Danny Tucker, Chairperson
5459 Dehesa Road
El Cajon, CA 92021
619 445-2613
619 445-1927 Fax

La Posta Band of Mission Indians
Gwendolyn Parada, Chairperson
PO Box 1120
Boulevard, CA 91905
(619) 478-2113

Viejas Band of Mission Indians
Anthony Pico, Chairperson
PO Box 908
Alpine, CA 91903
(619) 445-3810
(619) 445-5337 Fax

Manzanita Band of Mission Indians
Leroy J. Elliott, Chairperson
PO Box 1302
Boulevard, CA 91905
(619) 766-4930
(619) 766-4957 Fax

Kumeyaay Cultural Historic Committee
Ron Christman
56 Viejas Grade Road
Alpine, CA 92001
(619) 445-0385

San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians
Allen E. Lawson, Chairperson
PO Box 365
Valley Center, CA 92082
(760) 749-3200
(760) 749-3876 Fax

Campo Band of Mission Indians
Ralph Goff, Chairperson
36190 Church Road, Suite 1
Campo, CA 91906
(619) 478-9046
(619) 478-5818 Fax

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.95 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regards to cultural resources assessment for the proposed UCSD Long Range Development Plan, La Jolla.
NATIVE AMERICAN CONTACTS
San Diego County
December 23, 2003

Jamul Indian Village
Leon Acevedo, Chairperson
P.O. Box 612
Jamul, CA 91935
(619) 669-4785
Fax: (619) 669-4817

La Posta Band of Mission Indians
James Hill, Tribal Administrator
PO Box 1120
Diegueno Boulevard
Diegueno
CA 91905
(619) 478-2113

Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians
Howard Maxcy, Chairperson
P.O. Box 270
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070
(760) 782-3818
Fax: (760) 752-9092

Kumeyaay Cultural Heritage Preservation
Paul Cuero
36190 Church Road, Suite 5
Campio, CA 91906
Diegueno/Kumeyaay
(619) 478-9046
(619) 478-9083, ext. 222
(619) 478-5818 Fax

Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee
Steve Banegas, Spokesperson
1095 Barona Road
Lakeside, CA 92040
Diegueno/Kumeyaay
(619) 443-6612
(619) 443-0681 FAX

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.95 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regards to cultural resources assessment for the proposed UCSD Long Range Development Plan, La Jolla.
December 17, 2003

Catherine Presmyk
University of California
(Physical Planning Office, UCSD)
La Jolla, CA 92039-0965

RE: SCH# 2003081023 – 2004 Long Range Development Plan

Dear Ms. Presmyk:

After reviewing the above mentioned Notice of Preparation, I was unable to determine if the cultural resources in the project area have been adequately assessed based on the information provided in the environmental document. To adequately assess the project-related impact on archaeological resources, the Commission recommends the following action be required:

- Contact the appropriate Information Center for a records search. The record search will determine:
  - Whether a part or all of the project area has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
  - Whether any known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the project area.
  - Whether the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located within the project area.
  - Whether a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.
- The final stage of the archaeological inventory survey is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
- Required the report containing site significance and mitigation be submitted immediately to the planning department.
- Required site forms and final written report be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the Information Center.
- A record search of the Native American Heritage’s Sacred Lands File has failed to indicate the presence of Native American cultural resources in the immediate project area. However, the absence of specific site information in the sacred lands file does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in any project area.
- Enclosed is a list of Native Americans individuals/organizations who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. The Commission makes no recommendation or preference of a single individual, or group over another. This list should provide a starting place in locating areas of potential adverse impact within the proposed project area. I suggest you contact all of those indicated, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. A minimum of two weeks must be allowed for responses after notification. If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any these individuals or groups, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information.
- Lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude the existence of archeological resources. Lead agencies should include provisions for accidentally discovered archeological resources during construction per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5 (f). Health and Safety Code §7050.5 and Public Resources Code §5097.98 mandates the process to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery and should be included in all environmental documents. If you have any questions, please contact me at (916) 653-4038.

Sincerely,

Carol Gaubatz
Program Analyst
Native American Heritage Commission

cc: State Clearinghouse
NATIVE AMERICAN CONTACTS
San Diego County
December 17, 2003

Barona Group of the Capitan Grande
Clifford LaChappa, Spokesman
1095 Barona Road
Lakeside, CA 92040
(619) 443-6612/13

San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians
Allen E. Lawson, Chairperson
PO Box 365
Valley Center, CA 92082
(760) 749-3200
(760) 749-3876 Fax

Ewilaapaayp Tribal Office
Harlan Pinto, Chairperson
PO Box 2250
Alpine, CA 91903-2250
(619) 445-6315

Santa Ysabel Band of Diegueno Indians
Johnny Hernandez, Spokesman
PO Box 130
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070
(760) 765-0845
(760) 765-0320 Fax

La Posta Band of Mission Indians
Gwendolyn Parada, Chairperson
PO Box 1120
Boulevard, CA 91905
(619) 478-2113

Sycuan Band of Mission Indians
Danny Tucker, Chairperson
5459 Dehesa Road
El Cajon, CA 92021
619 445-2613
619 445-1927 Fax

Manzanita Band of Mission Indians
Leroy J. Elliott, Chairperson
PO Box 1302
Boulevard, CA 91905
(619) 766-4930
(619) 766-4957 Fax

Viejas Band of Mission Indians
Anthony Pico, Chairperson
PO Box 908
Alpine, CA 91903
(619) 445-3810
(619) 445-5337 Fax

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7060.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.96 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regards to cultural resources assessment for the proposed 2004 Long Range Draft EIR for UCSD, SCH# 2000081023, San Diego County.
NATIVE AMERICAN CONTACTS
San Diego County
December 17, 2003

Kumeyaay Cultural Historic Committee
Ron Christman
56 Viejas Grade Road
Alpine, CA 92001
(619) 445-0385

Kumeyaay Cultural Heritage Preservation
Paul Cuero
36190 Church Road, Suite 5
Campo, CA 91906
(619) 478-9046
(619) 478-9093, ext. 222
(619) 478-5818 Fax

Campo Band of Mission Indians
Ralph Goff, Chairperson
36190 Church Road, Suite 1
Campo, CA 91906
(619) 478-9046
(619) 478-5818 Fax

Carmen Lucas
PO Box 44
Julian, CA 92036
(619) 709-4207

Jamul Indian Village
Leon Acevedo, Chairperson
P.O. Box 612
Jamul, CA 91935
(619) 669-4785
Fax: (619) 669-4817

Inaja Band of Mission Indians
Rebecca Osuna
1040 East Parkway, Suite A
Escondido, CA 92025
(760) 747-8581
(760) 747-8568 Fax

Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians
Howard Maxcy, Chairperson
P.O Box 270
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070
(760) 782-3818
(760) 782-9092 Fax

Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee
Steve Banegas, Spokesperson
1095 Barona Road
Lakeside, CA 92040
(619) 443-6612
(619) 443-0681 FAX

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7060.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.86 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regards to cultural resources assessment for the proposed 2004 Long Range Draft EIR for UCSD, SCH# 2003081023, San Diego County.
NATIVE AMERICAN CONTACTS
San Diego County
December 17, 2003

La Posta Band of Mission Indians
James Hill, Tribal Administrator
PO Box 1120
Boulevard, CA 91905
(619) 478-2113

Coastal Gabrieleno Diegueno
Jim Velasques
5776 42nd Street
Riverside, CA 92509
(909) 784-6660

Diegueno
Gabrielino
Kumeyaay

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regards to cultural resources assessment for the proposed 2004 Long Range Draft EIR for UCSD, SCH# 2009081023, San Diego County.
December 10, 2003

Mr. Jeffrey A. Steindorf
Assistant Vice Chancellor Campus Planning
UCSD
9500 Gilman Drive, MC0006
La Jolla, CA.  92093-0006

Rc: 2004 Long Range Development Plan - #2003081023

Dear Chancellor:

I am in receipt of the NOP and the LRDP update and after brief review; I have the following comments and concerns:

- Hopkins Parking Garage – location concerning ingress/egress onto Voigt Lane and pollution effects on the walking, biking paths directly across from the site. I have utilized the ‘magic forest’ for exercise and walking on many occasions, 1,400 cars exhaust and noise could potentially damage wildlife, fauna, and vegetation in the preserve-canyons, not to mention the people exercising in the immediate area. Are plans for transit included in the design of the structure, e.g. transit stop for Coaster, flex-trolley, and UCSD shuttle? If so, what specific design and architectural elements are included and where in the facility are they located.

- School of Management – the proposed development of 85K sq. ft to 200K sq. ft. seems especially serious and onerous. Most notably, what pro-active transit plans are included in the development? Based on the literature, no parking is anticipated on this site, if this is true, the University would again be building a major facility with little or no thought towards transit alternatives other than the UCSD shuttle, in effect, creating a major traffic generator with several hundred, if not a thousand facility, students and visitors generating daily ADT’s to a remote auto depend site, similar to the research park off Genesee. North Torrey Pines and Genesee are already bottlenecks, with the pro-forma development of more ADT’s originating from the NW portion of campus, Genesee is likely to become a real traffic nightmare with accompanying negative impacts.

In summary, UCSD must equally consider expenditures on expanding the shuttle buses, perhaps a fleet of hydrogen powered vehicles, engineer into all new buildings transit stations and plan for a ‘shuttle only’ bridge over I-5 to move facility, students, and visitors to east campus underground parking that is linked to the coasier on Nobel and the flex-trolley system, all without complete dependence on the automobile. UCSD has world-renowned engineers at Jacobs School of
Engineering, UCSD has the top minds in the world working on ‘wireless’ devices through *CAL IT2*, surely, UCSD can innovate a model urban campus setting that relies mostly on transit for its needs.

I have been very involved in the planning initiatives in UTC-UC through UCPG for the past year and have great optimism regarding our area’s future. Our community initiatives are baseless without the full cooperation and participation of UCSD. Our community, which is nexus to the campus, is directly impacted by growth and development by UCSD, we strongly urge you to enlarge your vision in terms of land use, transportation and housing. Please incorporate more ‘transit solutions’ in your physical plant planning, go beyond CEQA requirements, and come to the table with innovation and bold transit initiatives.

Sincerely,

Michael Duffey, President
TransitNow, a public benefit Corporation
Jeffrey A. Steindorf  
Asst. Vice Chancellor, Campus Planning  
Univ. of Calif., San Diego

Dear Sir,

The location of the Hopkins Parking Garage in the North Central part of the West campus should be re-examined. The impact of 1400 cars entering and leaving the campus will alter the academic tradition of a pedestrian stroll. The soot, smog, and wastes from the automobile traffic will also impinge upon the health of campus life. The hazards of pedestrian and auto interaction are well established and should be eliminated from campus when possible.

The University should locate parking garages close to the freeway perimeter of the campus to encourage shared use with other public institutions or events to help finance the building and to spread the cost of operations beyond the campus population. The potential users of such an agreement (which would utilize the parking during periods of low campus populations) might include the Del Mar Agricultural Board for San Diego County Fair, the Del Mar Racing season, the Buick Invitational at Torrey Pines, large sporting events like the Super Bowl, America's Cup, the U.S. Open Golf Tournament, etc.

Locating the structure on the edge of campus near the freeway should have relatively few adverse impacts on the environment that is not already bearing the brunt of the traffic levels on the interstate.

Yours truly, 
Gail Forbes
Jeffrey A. Steindorf  
UCSD Assistant Vice Chancellor Campus Planning  
9500 Gilman Drive, M.C. 0006  
San Diego, CA 92093-0006  

By Mail and Confirmed Fax: 858.822.5990  
January 6, 2004

Re: Comments on REVISED NOP for DRAFT UCSD 2004 Long Range  
Development Plan (dated December 8, 2003), Sch. No. 2003081023

Dear Mr. Steindorf,

This letter is sent on behalf of my clients, the La Jolla Farms Homeowners. The  
Homeowners appreciate this opportunity to comment on the revised NOP for UCSD's  
proposed Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). Please include this letter, as well as  
our September 12, 2003 comment letter on the original NOP, 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. We understand the revised NOP identifies  
three additional specific development projects to be included in the Plan including:  
Hopkins Parking Garage, Supercomputer Center Expansion and the School of  
Management. Our comments inform their relationship to the campus-wide LRDP and  
EIR.

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 regarding the revised NOP**  
primarily concern the addition of the School of Management Building northeast of  
Eleanor Roosevelt College near the intersection with Salk Institute Road and  
include:

- **Location and Sufficiency of Parking.** The proposed development of buildings  
  would be phased such that the first phase would consist of 85,000 GSF, with  
  future phases adding approximately 115,000 for a total of up to 200,000 GSF at  
  the time of construction. We are concerned about the parking and access  
  needed at this location, which is already underserved.**
the public hearing on December 18, 2003, UCSD stated that the phase 2 building will receive subsequent environmental review. Where and how will sufficient resident, visitor, faculty and staff parking be provided at each phase, particularly where the hearing PowerPoint handout stated that 165 spaces would be removed to accommodate the School?;

- **Displacement of Future Colleges.** We are informed that at least one of the future UCSD colleges was to be located in the area proposed for the School of Management; where would these future colleges then be located? We are concerned that an attempt might be made to relocate such uses onto sensitive coastal mesas and areas that would therefore intensify environmental, coastal parking and residential encroachment issues. Where would such future colleges be likely to be located?;

- **Limiting Potential to Partner with the Salk Institute.** The area proposed for the School of Management is one of the remaining campus areas most proximate to the Salk campus. It would seem that this type of area would be ideal for achieving mutually beneficial partnerships including those related to shared facilities such as recreational, daycare and other uses, away from environmentally sensitive coastal areas. Does the location of the Management School limit the potential for partnerships?

We are pleased that the University has again assured that the peripheral consequences of campus development and community concerns will be addressed and the university's position as being a responsible steward of valuable public resources will be maintained (La Jolla Light, "Planning for Growth," January 1, 2004). We look forward to seeing our concerns addressed in the documents and believe incorporation of our concerns into the Plan will satisfy the nine factors as well as meet or enhance the document's stated purposes to provide a broad, coherent and adaptable framework to achieve UCSD's academic and support program goals and to inform decisions concerning land use, decisions 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
Richard A. Murphy, Salk Institute, President and CEO (w/ Sept. 12 letter)
Client file
Penelope Bourk

From: Penelope Bourk (pbourk@san.rr.com)
Sent: Saturday, January 03, 2004 1:52 PM
To: Milton Phegley (mphphegley@ucsd.edu); 'cpremyk@ucsd.edu'
Cc: Linda Smith (lindem@san.rr.com); Mary Coakley; Sue Moore (sue@mind.ucsd.edu); Susan Goulian (sgoulian@ucsd.edu)
Subject: UCSD LRDP and Hillel Site Devel. Permit Application 12-31-03

University of California, San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA 92037-0965
January 3, 2004

RE: UCSD Long Range Development Plan

Dear Ms. Presmyk and Mr. Phegley:

Attached is a notice of application for a site development permit application for "commercial" office space for Hillel at 8976 Cliffridge Ave, a house directly across from my home in the single family residential neighborhood of La Jolla Highlands directly south of the UCSD campus. UCSD should already have received Hillel's notice of application, as the application for commercial uses refers to a home within 300 feet of the campus. Also attached are photos of current signage announcing availability of office space for lease and property for sale close to the campus. I believe the site for sale at Gilman and Via Alicante is located very near a UCSD shuttle route. Perhaps you could check that for me.

As has been brought to UCSD's attention at the two UCSD LRDP scoping meetings in 2003, the residential neighborhood in the single family residence zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District to the south of UCSD is greatly concerned about UCSD-student-affiliated institution(s) attempting to convert homes into office space and to build on parkland.

The attached application for a change of use from single family residential to UCSD-oriented institutional "commercial" office use is a case in point, as is the current lawsuit filed by this neighborhood against the City of San Diego concerning the encroachment proposal by Hillel of San Diego to build a 10,000 sq. ft student center on publicly owned open space park site 653.

Hillel's application to convert a home to office space is particularly inappropriate given the fact that numerous vacancies currently exist in office buildings in mixed use areas and commercial areas, four of them equally proximal to UCSD campus along North Torrey Pines, Villa La Jolla and La Jolla Village Drive, in the mixed-use area of the University (City)Community Plan to the east, specifically designated for that purpose in earlier planning for UCSD.

While in a strict sense, Hillel of San Diego's name suggests a broader purview, obvious facts, that the group has long used a UCSD address (the same as yours, 9500 Gilman!) and has long used campus office space (albeit in a trailer in the middle of campus) to meet the religious needs of two thousand to three thousand Jewish UCSD students, make it hard for UCSD to pretend that Hillel of San Diego as currently led by Rabbi Lisa Goldstein and Mr. Singer has no affiliation with UCSD.

As the La Jolla Highlands and Heights area has urged in the past, we request again that UCSD look more closely into placement of auxiliary or affiliated institutional developments in appropriately zoned locations, such as mixed use, commercial, or visitor zones, or to find some way to accommodate an inter-faith institute on campus, meanwhile actively upholding the zoning and land use intentions of the surrounding residential communities.
You have referred to a legal interpretation by UCSD, or by the UC Regents, that disallows religious groups from establishing facilities on the UCSD campus. Would you be so kind as to forward me the text of that legal interpretation so that affected residents near UCSD can become better acquainted with the legal situation?

If indeed there is a legal interpretation that excludes necessary services for university students, then the LRDP for UCSD should offer alternatives and mitigations. The residential neighborhoods that pre-existed the establishment of the university should not be expected to bear the brunt of UCSD legal interpretations or UCSD's and the City's long-term lack of planning. Neither should the residential neighborhood, so clearly outlined as single family residential in the current 1995 La Jolla Community Plan and its 2003 update, be forced into unending vigilance, thousands of hours of community action, and expensive litigation merely because certain university-oriented groups stubbornly refuse to locate in appropriately zoned areas, but instead choose to override the La Jolla Community Plan, the City Council policies, resolutions and ordinances, and to lobby for takeover of single family residential space and parkland for office and "commercial" uses. As you probably are already aware, the Hillel facilities at other UC campuses are not located in single family residential areas, but in mixed use and commercial zones.

I look forward to receiving the requested documentation concerning legal decisions about university-affiliated student religious needs. Meanwhile please include the above in the UCSD LRDP documentation and make plans for mitigation outside the single family residence zones of La Jolla. Since Hillel is only one of several university-affiliated groups currently without a permanent location, proper planning in zone-appropriate locations would benefit a significant portion of the UCSD population. That same planning would provide the necessary stability and protection for the surrounding residential areas in the La Jolla Shores Planned District.

On many occasions, UCSD has publicly announced its intention to be a good neighbor. Now is such a time.

Sincerely,

Penelope Bourk
8975 Cliffridge Ave.
La Jolla 92037
DATE OF NOTICE: December 31, 2003

NOTICE OF APPLICATION
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
Job Order No. 42-2107

As a property owner, tenant, or person who has requested notice, you should know that an application has been filed with the City of San Diego for a Site Development Permit to change the use of an existing single family residence to commercial office space and demolish existing detached garage(storage building to create additional parking on a 7,166-square-foot site. The property is located at 8976 Cliffridge Avenue in the SF Zone of La Jolla Shores Planned District within the La Jolla Community Plan, Coastal Height Limit. Council District 1.

PROJECT TYPE/NUMBER: SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT / PROJECT NO. 20140
PROJECT NAME: HILLEL OF SAN DIEGO
CONTACT NAME: ROBERT LAPIVUS
COMMUNITY PLAN AREA: LA JOLLA
CITY PROJECT MANAGER: Robert Korch, Development Project Manager
MANAGER PHONE NUMBER: (619) 444-5529

The decision to approve or deny this application will be made at a public hearing. You will receive another notice informing you of the date, time, and location of the public hearing. In addition, this item will be discussed by the Community Planning Group for the area in which the project is located. They will make an advisory recommendation to the City of San Diego.

You may contact Claude-Anthony Marengo of the La Jolla Community Planning Association at (858) 456-7900 to inquire about the community planning group meeting dates, times, and location for community review of this project.

If you have any questions regarding this application after reviewing this information, you can call the City of San Diego Project Manager listed above.

This information will be made available in alternative formats upon request.
Subject: UCSD LRDP and "tiered" studies: New school of management, parking lots, Mayer Hall, etc.

Catherine Presmyk and Milton Phegley,
UCSD Physical Planning
8500 Gilman Dr. M.C. 0865
La Jolla CA, 92037-0865

Dear Ms. Presmyk and Mr. Phegley,

I have attended both the summer 2003 scoping meeting for UCSD LRDP and the Dec. 18 2003 meeting. Please include my concerns in your consideration of necessary mitigations for the EIR and for CEQA requirements for the many expansions currently underway and anticipated at UCSD.

My concerns are the following:

1. The proposed construction of an immense parking lot behind the Sociology building, on what appears to be necessary open space for the dorms (now for Sixth College) not only takes away the open space students living in the dorms need as a breathing space, but substitutes instead a multi-level parking lot, of significant height, with pollution issues, noise, traffic, possible health and safety issues, etc., right beside those same dorms. In addition, construction of the large parking lot at that location will bring additional cars into the middle of campus. Is there no other location a little farther from residences and more to the periphery of the campus for such a structure?

2. The southernmost wing of the proposed Graduate School of Management along Ridge Walk continues to concern me. As you know from my testimony at the Dec. hearing, I consider Ridge Walk a treasure of UCSD. Now instead of providing an irreplaceable view both to the ocean in the west and the mountains to the east, Ridge Walk is in danger of becoming a tunnel between buildings. Eleanor Roosevelt's bridge structure effectively blocks one important vista to the ocean. The supposed "view corridor" described at the Dec. 18 meeting as between the Eleanor Roosevelt dorms and the southernmost wing of the proposed School of Management is so minimal and directional that another substantial section of ocean view is all but obliterated. Virtually no view corridor remains between those buildings for pedestrian traffic walking from north to south on Ridge Walk, furthering the sense of the tunneling of this marvelous vista. At the very least, a vista should be provided for pedestrians in both directions, to remind people where they are -- at the ridge between ocean and mountain on a majestic campus -- that is about to destroy its own natural beauty. Please don't suppose people won't notice. They are already lamenting the recent losses of vista, with the hotel below and the ER dorm. The vista from Ridge Walk is a precious resource to so many people. Are you going to sacrifice it for a few offices for high ranking administrators at the proposed School of Management? How can you mitigate the loss of such beauty, of the unique sense of place Ridge Walk provides to UCSD students, staff, international visitors and local patrons? At the very least you could rotate the southern arm of the proposed school of management building to parallel ER dorms. I would like to know what else you plan to do to mitigate the loss of such majesty.

3. I have just received another "tiered" study announcement, this one on Mayer Hall Renovation, nearer my own neighborhood of La Jolla Highlands. The proposed reno and 79,000gsf building addition is yet another of many recent "tiered" studies of UCSD developments. Is it possible that all these "Tiered" additions to UCSD are an effort to sidestep the cumulative effect in EIR's and CEQA requirements, which would result if all these projects were considered together? For instance, not far from Mayer Hall is the new theater abutting La Jolla Village
Drive, the proposed daycare center at Expedition way, further along, the hotel, then the huge parking structure that looms so ghoulishly, as docs ER dorm, over North Torrey Pines, then the proposed school of management..... How do you plan to accommodate intensified Mayer Hall uses, daycare drop-ins, drop-offs, staff, etc., and the theatre patrons, an increasing number of whom, even without the third theatre, park not on campus, but in the residential neighborhood to the south?

4. What becomes clear with all the proposed development is that traffic patterns, already somewhat congested, must be mitigated in a more substantial way. The increase in UCSD development, Mayer Hall, the Theatre District, the daycare center at Expedition Way, the Hotel, the School of Management, Eleanor Roosevelt dorms, the new and proposed parking structures along North Torrey Pines, to name a few, will likely cause a worsening of already challenging traffic issues along the southwest corner of the campus. La Jolla Village Drive at Torrey Pines is already congested in three directions. North Torrey Pines at Expedition Way, and at La Jolla Shores Dr. will have increased impact. Simply widening La Jolla Village Drive into a wider freeway-sized road, at certain times of the day more like a parking lot, is not enough.

5. Additional roadway mitigation for UCSD’s proposed doubling is necessary. An onramp from La Jolla Parkway (previously Ardath Road) to Highway 5 North is now essential so that all traffic coming north from La Jolla is not routed up Torrey Pines and along La Jolla Village Drive, colliding with the ever-increasing UCSD traffic which bypasses the long-and-still-awaited-campus-trolley-stop far to the east.

6. A strong UCSD relationship with District One Council Office, an attentive City Manager, a competent City Attorney, and a vigilant City Council (and other miracles!) could cement relationships between UCSD and the City. A local committee for District One effects of UCSD should be formed, including nearby homeowners and their associations, to ensure CEQA requirements, EIR accountability, and mitigation for cumulative effects of UCSD expansion do not become a double burden to taxpayers who foot the bill for the university, then again must fight against neighborhood overwhelm, and pick up the bill for any problems that the university has caused without true accountability for fixing. (See previous memo on Hillel’s permit application for “commercial office space” by converting a home in our neighborhood, and the university’s long-range lack of planning for affiliates). Mitigations must meet needs, not simply obscure the problems or foist them off on the surrounding community.

7. Again, I would like to ask you to hold hearings when students, faculty, staff, and others are on campus, not after they’ve all left for winter break, or midsummer, before they return to campus. Late December and mid-August are good times to hold hearings you don’t want many people to attend. I hope that is not your intention. It if is, scheduling meetings at more accessible times should be brought up as a mitigation issue for any future development.

Finally, I think UCSD occupies an unspeakably beautiful location. I thank you for the opportunity to review plans, to receive notification, and to respond to UCSD
expansion issues. Please consider the cumulative effects of expansions and the
terrible losses of less-than-optimal misplanning. We understand your desire to build a
world-class university. To retain world-class beauty on a humane, human-scale
campus—ah, there's the rub. All of us are counting on you.

Sincerely,

Penelope Bourk
8975 Cliffridge Ave.
La Jolla CA 92037