I generally approve of the draft EIR and applaud the impressive work product of the consultants work; however, I do have several major concerns about the future build out of the comprehensive UCSD plan. Here are my summarized comments:

FBA - Facilities Benefit Assessment

A. UCSD contributions to City of San Diego Transportation projects directly affecting University City are marginal at best. UCSD could offer in-kind support services for signalization, design/engineering elements for transit stations, traffic engineering through the Jacobs School of Engineering.

B. It is without dispute that UCSD benefits directly from the expenditures of money from the FBA account. UCSD should make it a top priority to provide valuable in-kind services to solve the many challenges facing our communities of interest.

The La Jolla Campus is the largest land user in UC

A. As the largest land user component in University City, each time UCSD sneezes, all neighborhoods and environs of the campus feel the impact.

B. Parking is a major concern for those of us who live near UCSD. There simply are not enough major collector ramps for in-bound students or students who ride the shuttle and park-n-ride from our neighborhoods. This is especially the case on Arriba Street and Regents Road south of Nobel. A decrease in overall parking associated with Rady School of Management, even a 183 net spaces lost is material in any development scenario; the official UCSD policy ought to be a net gain, not a net loss.

C. UCSD should undertake a major expansion of park-n-ride collector sites on campus, especially East Campus associated with the Science Research Park at Regents & Genessee Avenue.

East Campus Expansion

A. The draft EIR omitted to include projections for Nobel and 805: ramp speed. In-bound/out-bound.

B. The draft EIR omitted important material disclosures regarding the build-out of Science Research Park at Regents & Genessee.

C. The draft EIR omitted important land use disclosures regarding Mesa Housing and its future plans.

D. East Campus has the most direct impact on 15,000+ residential inhabitants along Regents Road from Eastgate Mall to the present end of Regents Road.

Responses

O1-1

As discussed in Section 4.13, Transportation, Traffic, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, UCSD has and will continue to support transportation improvements in the community, which has included providing right-of-way, project management and preliminary engineering for a number of city projects. Refer to Response L3-5 for further discussion regarding the feasibility of UCSD contributions to community traffic improvements. See also Responses L3-5 and T1-20.

O1-2

Refer to Response O1-1 (above) and L3-5. The University provides many benefits and services to the community; however, it is beyond the scope of this EIR to evaluate them here.

O1-3

No response is required.

O1-4

Potential parking impacts from implementation of the proposed 2004 LRDP are discussed in Section 4.13 of the Draft EIR. Potential parking impacts associated with the proposed Rady School of Management project are further discussed in Section 4.13 of its project level analysis. As discussed in these sections, UCSD’s parking target is a ratio of 0.41 space per capita which maintains a 90 percent peak parking occupancy. The current parking ratio is 0.53. The loss of 183 spaces due to the construction of the Rady School of Management would not drop the ratio to below 0.41; therefore, impacts are not significant. Furthermore, the proposed Hopkins Parking Structure, which is located nearby and is on a similar project schedule, would provide over 1,400 new spaces to the northwestern portion of the west campus. See also Responses O5-1 and O7-1.

UCSD currently operates an extensive shuttle system with stops at the parking lots on the east campus, as well as other parking locations throughout the campus and at transit and residential locations in the surrounding community. As discussed in Section 4.13, Transportation, Traffic, and Parking, of the Draft EIR, UCSD will continue to implement its alternative transportation program, which includes the shuttle operations, expanding upon it where appropriate. Expansion of the program requires consideration of a number of factors including current operations, demand, and funding availability. Based on existing parking data, there is no indication that there is unmet demand for parking on the east campus (excess capacity is available during peak hours and the campus-wide parking ratio remains acceptable). See also Responses O5-1 and O7-1.

Freeway ramps analyzed for the 2004 LRDP EIR were identified using the CMP Traffic Study Guidelines and in cooperation with City of San Diego transportation staff. The CMP guidelines indicate that freeway ramps to be included in the analysis are those where the proposed project would “add a
significantly number of peak hour trips to cause any traffic queues to exceed ramp storage capacities.” UCSD’s traffic consultant, Kimley-Horn and Associates, in consultation with the City of San Diego, determined that the Nobel Drive and I-805 ramps did not meet this criteria and, therefore, were not included in this analysis.

Development at the Science Research Park on the east campus is identified in numerous locations in the Draft EIR and the associated potential environmental impacts from that development are analyzed throughout the EIR. Foremost, the proposed 2004 LRDP land use plan (Figure 3.4-5 of the Draft EIR) clearly identifies the Science Research Park land use on the east campus and square footage for the Science Research Park is identified in Table 3.4-4 of the Draft EIR. Furthermore, as a Program EIR, this document does not provide project specific details and analysis (refer to Response L2-1). Additionally, the Science Research Park was analyzed in the Science Research Park EIR prepared pursuant to CEQA, certified by the Regents in July 2002 (SCH No. 1999081028). The comment does not specify what material disclosures are believed to be omitted from the Draft EIR. Therefore, an additional response is not possible.

The proposed 2004 LRDP land use plan (Figure 3.4-5) clearly identifies the Housing land use designation over the Mesa Housing complex. Also, it is clearly visible in the land use plan that the additional Housing land use designation extends to the west of the existing Mesa Housing complex. Furthermore, as previously discussed, a Program EIR does not include project specific details and analysis (refer to Response L2-1). The comment does not specify what land use disclosures are believed to be omitted. Therefore, an additional response is not possible.

Impacts from development of the east campus to nearby residents are addressed in several sections of the Draft EIR including Sections 4.1 Aesthetics, 4.6 Land Use, and 4.13 Transportation, Traffic, and Parking. The comment does not raise any additional issues; therefore, no further response is required.

Impacts from development of the Science Research Park to nearby residents were addressed in the Science Research Park EIR (see Response O1-7) and are addressed in several sections of the Draft EIR including Sections 4.1 Aesthetics, 4.6 Land Use, and 4.13 Transportation, Traffic, and Parking. For further response, refer to Responses O1-6 through O1-9.

UCSD has been working on development of an advanced technology bridge that would connect Gilman Drive north of the Veteran Administration Hospital to east campus at Health Sciences Drive south and west of Thornton Hospital.
This bridge would provide a second connection over I-5 between the east and west campus and would complete the campus loop road concept as envisioned in the 2004 LRDP. Work on the bridge began in earnest in 2001 including development of criteria and alternative designs for the bridge; prototype and full-scale testing of the composite components; instrumentation testing; a Value Engineering analysis of the project; preliminary environmental documentation; and planning, specification and estimate documents. However, as a consequence of the escalating cost of bridge construction and four consecutive years of state budget cuts, UCSD does not have the financial resources to contribute to, and continue, this project at this time. In the future when funding becomes available, UCSD would anticipate progressing the bridge project and at such time, project level CEQA review would occur. With regard to light rail, SANDAG’s preferred alignment does approach the campus on the west side of I-5, but then tunnels under Gilman Drive to arrive at grade at the northeast corner of Pepper Canyon. SANDAG’s plan for LRT through the campus does not include a park and ride facility.

Refer to Response O7-1 regarding use of alternative energy UCSD shuttles and Response O1-5 regarding expansion of the shuttle system. With regard to surface lot parking, UCSD anticipates that the majority of future parking projects will consist of parking structures. However, it should be noted that structured parking is considerably more expensive than surface parking. As discussed in the Draft EIR and mitigation measure Tra-2A, UCSD has and will continue to provide adequate parking by maintaining a parking ratio of approximately 0.41, a parameter that maintains a 10 percent vacancy rate. The commenter’s assertion regarding the validity of the ratio is not supported. In 2003-04, there were approximately 1,500 vacant permit spaces in UCSD parking facilities during peak hours. Refer also to Response O5-1.

SANDAG’s 2003 Mid-Coast Strategic Transportation Study, which includes the potential new Coaster station at Nobel Drive, was reviewed and considered during the preparation of the 2004 LRDP EIR. As identified in Table 4-2 of the Draft EIR, the University Area Super Loop Bus, which may have a connection to the new Coaster station at Nobel Drive, was considered as a cumulative project. As discussed in Section 4.13 of the Draft EIR, UCSD supports the Super Loop and will coordinate with SANDAG on improvements to facilitate the program. Additional discussion of the potential new Coaster station would be speculation and is not part of the 2004 LRDP. Therefore, it is not necessary in the EIR.
O2-1 Refer to Attachment 2, Summary of Implementation of 1989 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures and Response O18-1.

O2-2 Funding for infrastructure in the City of San Diego comes from a variety of sources. More detailed information can be obtained by contacting the City directly, however, it is beyond the scope of the 2004 LRDP.

O2-3 As discussed in Section 15090(b) of the state CEQA Guidelines, Public Resource Code Section 21151(c) provides that where an EIR has been certified by a non-elected decision making body, that certification may be appealed to the agency’s elected decision making body, if any. There is no elected decision making body for the University of California and therefore this regulation does not apply.
NAME: Selzer, Jeffrey
DATE: June 15, 2004

LRDP EIR COMMENTS:
I strongly object to the proposed destruction of about 4/5 of the existing designated park area adjacent to, and south of, Azul Street (figure 4.3-2, page 21 of the EIR). A homeowner on Poole since 1982, I love to walk through these shady trees with my family. The grove comforts us from the noise and artificial structures that surround us. It is home to wildlife, such as the greathorned owl and other birds. Have you studied the impact on wildlife in this grove?

Just as UCSD needs its treasured eucalyptus trees to provide a balance with nature, so do the residents of our community. Please keep this park land intact.

HOPKINS PARKING STRUCTURE COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.

SAN DIEGO SUPERCOMPUTER EXPANSION COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.

RADY SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT FACILITY COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.

RESPONSES

The area referred to by the commentor is south of Azul Street, east of the Coast Apartments, north of Expedition Way, and west of North Torrey Pines Road. This area is currently undeveloped, however, it is not designated entirely as “UCSD Park.” In the 1989 LRDP land use plan, the majority of the land in this area was designated as Housing. This designation was carried over to the 2004 LRDP land use plan. However, both plans also include a large 60-foot setback that runs parallel to and immediately south of Azul Street retained as eucalyptus grove in the UCSD Park (see Draft EIR Figures 3.4-4 and 3.4-5). The potential biological impacts of developing the area were considered in the 2004 LRDP EIR. Impacts to wildlife and other biological resources in this area are discussed in Section 4.3 of the Draft EIR.
COMMENTS

June 15, 2004

Ms. Catherine Presmyk
UCSD
Physical Planning
9500 Gilman Drive M.C. 0965
La Jolla, CA 92093-0965

Dear Ms. Presmyk,

Thank you for the opportunity for commenting on the Draft UCSD 2004 Long-Range Development Plan. Clearly, a lot of good work has gone into this effort.

O4-1
On page 8, paragraph 5, the word “Sputnik” is misspelled as “Spudnik.”

O4-2
Of the nine factors listed on page 14 that were used in the preparation of this Plan, I am pleased to note that “UCSD’s unique characteristics in light of its history and culture” were considered, as were the “needs and interests of the surrounding community, city, state, and nation.” And yet, the listing on the CEQA did not include “historic sites.”

O4-3
Page 28, Section 6, makes no mention of the Gliderport as a recreational facility on campus in spite of the fact that this parcel has been used by UCSD Glider Clubs in the past and by the Associated Glider Clubs of Southern California presently.

O4-4
Page 30, Section 1, indicates that the Veterans Administration Medical Center was deeded by the University to the federal government. It might be equally appropriate to deed this historic Gliderport to CalTrans for its continued operation.

O4-5
Page 35, Table 4, lists the Gliderport property as “undeveloped,” but suggests that areas developed as open space should be left in the “developed” column. Why not protect this historic Gliderport property as open space?

O4-6
Page 60 notes that for the Ecological Reserve, “no buildings, roads, or driveways will be permitted in this area of the park.” Page 42, Section 3, correctly affirms the Gliderport as being listed on the National Register of Historic Places. This historic Gliderport deserves equal protection as the Ecological Reserve.

O4-7
Page 57 indicates the Gliderport as a “future” neighborhood. Please clarify the nature of this future development.

1591 Calle de Cinco
La Jolla, CA 92037
858-455-6449

RESPONSES

O4-1
This is a comment on the proposed 2004 LRDP. The spelling error identified in this comment has been corrected in the LRDP.

O4-2
This is a comment on the proposed 2004 LRDP. Potential impacts to historic sites from implementation of the proposed 2004 LRDP are addressed in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, of the Draft EIR.

O4-3
This is a comment on Section 6 of the proposed 2004 LRDP. The past and present use of the Gliderport is discussed in the Draft EIR in Sections 4.4, Cultural Resources, and 4.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Refer to Response S1-7 for discussion regarding UCSD’s reorientation of planned land uses on the Gliderport property to accommodate the gliderport activities.

O4-4
This is a comment on the proposed 2004 LRDP. The proposed 2004 LRDP would not preclude the existing use of the northern portion of the UCSD Gliderport property by fixed wing gliders. Therefore, the commentor’s suggestion to deed the Gliderport to Caltrans is not necessary. Refer to Response S1-7.

O4-5
This is a comment and question on the proposed 2004 LRDP. Potential impacts with regard to the historic use of the Gliderport are discussed in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, of the Draft EIR. Also refer to Response S1-7.

O4-6
This is a comment on the proposed 2004 LRDP. Potential impacts with regard to the historic use of the Gliderport and its listing on the National Register of Historic Places are discussed in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, of the Draft EIR. The Park Ecological Reserve is characterized by higher quality biological resources, which are generally lacking from the Gliderport. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to designate it as such. However, UCSD believes glider activities and development at the site can coexist if planned thoughtfully. Refer to Response S5-7 for more description of the purpose of the UCSD Park.

O4-7
This is a comment on the proposed 2004 LRDP. The neighborhood designation shown on Page 57 of the proposed 2004 LRDP is described on Page 56 as one of five planning principles. A neighborhood is a planning principle of the 1989 and 2004 LRDPs. A neighborhood is a distinctly bounded area on-campus. The defined boundaries for the future neighborhood are the Torrey Pines Golf Course, the Pacific Ocean/bluffs, Torrey Pines Scenic Drive, and North Torrey Pines Road. Figure 11 of the proposed 2004 LRDP illustrates the proposed land uses on the campus, including the Gliderport property, which are described on pages 62 and 64 of the LRDP. No further development is proposed at this time for the Gliderport property. If any development is proposed, it would undergo site and project specific CEQA review at that time.
This is a comment on the proposed 2004 LRDP. Revision to the Park designation is not necessary or appropriate. Refer to Response S5-7 for a description of the Park designation and to Response S1-7 regarding maintenance of gliderport activities on the Gliderport property.

UCSD shares the commentor’s concerns regarding the value of the Gliderport property and does not intend to preclude the use of the property for glider activities.

Sincerely,

Lawrence J. Fegel, Ph.D.

1591 Calle de Cinco
La Jolla, CA 92037
858-455-6449
NAME: McLaughlin, Nancy  
DATE: June 22, 2004

LRDP EIR COMMENTS:
I checked out the UCSD planning until 2021 info. From what I could determine there are currently 33,100 faculty, staff and students on campus and there are 15,400 parking spaces. It also looks like UCSD intends to maintain approx. the same ratio into the future. So with these preliminary statistics it is not difficult to understand why every commercial parking lot and all street parking within 2-3 miles of campus is being invaded by UCSD students who do not want to pay a high parking fees. They take the UCSD shuttle to campus and leave their cars parked along the streets all day. In my opinion, the only way to solve the problem (and with every street parking space taken in our whole community especially during the academic year) it is a problem that needs immediate attention. UCSD should develop the parking lots they have on the books pronto and also lower the student parking rates to a more reasonable amount. After all, UCSD does have a responsibility to provide services equal to their rapid growth. It certainly has become a serious PR issue and “an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure” surely applies to this issue if UCSD lets it go much longer without taking some kind of remedial steps. UCSD should think of every way possible to enable students park on campus and then take some action to make students park on campus. If they charged the students who truly need to use the shuttle a quarter a ride it would help pay for parking expansion and the cost of the shuttle service.

HOPKINS PARKING STRUCTURE COMMENTS:  
No comment on this section.

SAN DIEGO SUPERCOMPUTER EXPANSION COMMENTS:  
No comment on this section.

RADY SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT FACILITY COMMENTS:  
No comment on this section.

RESPONSES

UCSD has and will continue to provide adequate parking by maintaining a parking ratio of approximately 0.41, a parameter that maintains a 10 percent vacancy rate. UCSD Transportation and Parking Services (TPS) collects detailed data on campus parking use and availability, which it uses to manage on-campus parking. On at least five days a quarter at each parking lot, parking usage is tracked hourly throughout the day. This data can be viewed online at http://www.parking.ucsd.edu/survey/surv.html and is available by request from TPS. Based on Winter 2004 data, the average overall space occupancy during the peak hour at the La Jolla campus was 84 percent and there were approximately 1,500 vacant permit spaces in UCSD parking facilities during peak hours. This data and historic data collected by TPS supports UCSD’s parking target ratio of 0.41 space per capita, which it is currently exceeded by approximately 0.12 space per capita. As discussed in Section 4.13 of the Draft EIR, significant impacts may occur if the ratio dropped below 0.41. If this were projected to occur, measures to mitigate associated parking supply impacts are identified in LRDP Mitigation Measures Tra-2A and include additional parking facilities, reallocation of parking spaces, and provision of alternative transportation facilities.

As discussed in Section 4.13, Transportation, Traffic, and Parking, UCSD acknowledges that parking problems are occurring but concludes that the impacts are less than significant. As discussed in Section 4.13, UCSD is aware that some students, faculty, staff, and visitors choose to park on public streets surrounding the campus and believes that the majority of those who park on the adjacent public streets do so to avoid paying for parking on campus. UCSD also acknowledges that this occurrence may be a nuisance to some residents in the neighborhoods adjacent to the campus but concludes that impacts are less than significant because the parking is an allowed use based on the City of San Diego’s posted parking regulations.

Although these existing and future parking do not constitute “significant impacts” requiring mitigation under the 2004 LRDP EIR, University actions to address the concerns of the community are included herein. In the fall of 2004, UCSD will take the following approach to address community concerns related to the UCSD related parking in the surrounding neighborhoods.

· Off-campus Parking Restrictions – UCSD is supportive of the City examining the merits of implementing parking measures on city streets that alleviate community concerns. In cooperation with the City of San Diego and residents, UCSD will participate in the examination of local off-campus street segments, which are potentially affected by UCSD-related on-street parking. The area to be examined will include, but not be limited to, the study area identified in Section 4.13.1.5 of the Draft EIR.
Some commentors have suggested other remedial steps for reducing existing off-campus parking conditions in residential neighborhoods. These suggestions have been reviewed by UCSD and are discussed below.

(1) **Off-site Commuter or Park-and-Ride Lots** – UCSD does not believe that this would be an effective or feasible solution at this time because capacity is still available during peak hours in on-campus parking lots; it would not be an effective deterrent to those parking on the residential streets until parking restrictions on those streets are in place; and costs associated with acquisition of land, lot development, and operations would limit the feasibility.

(2) **Reduced Parking Fees and Cityshuttle Fees** – Parking fees are necessary to pay for parking construction and operation. Reduction of annual UCSD parking fees is not a feasible option because the current fee structure provides funding for all Transportation and Parking operations. Other sources of revenue would be required to support a reduction of fees. Based on the experience of other UC campuses, carrying money on shuttles not only slows operations but also makes them more dangerous to operate given the potential for theft. To keep costs as low as possible, most of the drivers are students. Therefore, this is not a desirable option for UCSD.

(3) **Temporary Parking Lots** – Temporary parking lots require extensive development, including water quality controls to prevent pollutants from being discharged from the site. However, UCSD is currently developing 722 surface parking spaces in facilities east of I-5. UCSD has also developed concepts for two parking structures that will accommodate 3,523 cars. The Hopkins Parking Structure, which is analyzed in Volume III of the Draft EIR, is scheduled to start construction in the near future. The Revelle Parking Structure is undergoing preliminary planning and is likely to be proposed in 2005. However, excess capacity is still available in some parking lots during peak hours and the campus-wide parking ratio is currently acceptable.
UCSD appreciates the suggestion. This vacant land is planned for academic uses and associated parking at some point in the future and therefore cannot be used for parking. The development of the site for parking as a temporary use would be an expensive interim use. Even if it were developed for parking use, a parking charge for users would be necessary. Such an expenditure of funds when adequate surplus parking spaces exist on campus would not be a prudent action.
COMMENTS

This comment focuses on the existing operations of UCSD’s off-campus shuttle system (Cityshuttle). Several other individuals and organizations commented on this issue. This response is intended to respond to all shuttle related comments. Potential traffic, parking (off-campus parking impact information is in Section 4.13.3.2), noise, and air quality impacts associated with the proposed 2004 LRDP are discussed in the Draft EIR. The analysis of these impacts compare existing with future conditions resulting from LRDP implementation. Existing conditions include the current UCSD shuttle bus operations.

Off-campus traffic and noise impacts in the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR are addressed on a total daily volume basis (including UCSD-related traffic); significant increases in traffic volume equate to an increase in noise. The noise analysis found that significant increases in vehicular noise only occurred on one segment south of SR-52 in association with 2004 LRDP growth. Future community plan traffic volumes include UCSD associated traffic. It is acknowledged in the Draft EIR (Section 4.13.3.2) that off-campus parking and associated issues are “nuisance” issues, but do not constitute a “significant adverse impact,” as defined by CEQA.

Since its implementation in 2002, the Cityshuttle has been a tremendous success in addressing the commuting needs of the student, staff, and faculty residents of UTC/University City areas, and as such, has reduced traffic and air quality impacts that otherwise would have occurred. The Cityshuttle route provides 23 stops along Gilman Drive, Villa La Jolla Drive and adjacent streets, east along Nobel Drive to the La Jolla Colony area, and as far east as the Westfield-UTC shopping center. Over 6,000 daily passengers were served during the 2003-04 academic year. UCSD hopes to expand this service in the future to continue to alleviate single occupancy vehicle traffic congestion and pollution in the UTC/University City areas.

Although any existing or future impacts from Cityshuttle do not constitute “significant impacts” under the 2004 LRDP EIR, actions to address the concerns of the community are included herein. In the fall of 2004, UCSD will take the following approach to address community concerns related to the Cityshuttle service.

(1) Shuttle Bus Safety – In addition to existing driver training programs, UCSD will implement a shuttle bus driver training awareness program to make them more aware of specific safety concerns related to driving within residential neighborhoods.

RESPONSES

O7-1

The comments are received and appreciated. They are reprinted below for public record:

Catherine Presmyk
Physical Planning
UCSD
9500 Gilman Dr. MC 0965
La Jolla, CA 92037-0965
June 26, 2004

Dear Ms. Presmyk:

We are writing in objection to UCSD’s Shuttle service. We find these busses noisy, smoky, and usually speeding through out our neighborhood. The students using this bus service are causing serious problems in parking as well as trash, and debris that their garbage.

Please consider re-routing these busses off Villa La Jolla Drive. Totally. Too many homeowners are unhappy. In addition, we need to have their neighborhoods returned to the peace and quiet they purchased originally.

Thank you.

Mr. and Mrs. Marshall van Osten
8644 - 4 Villa La Jolla Dr.
La Jolla, CA 92037-2302
CC: Scott Peters S.D City Council

Jun 3 0 2004
Phys Planning Office
Received
(2) **Good Neighbors Program** – UCSD will develop a passenger education program to reinforce to the shuttle riders the need to be good neighbors when waiting for or departing from the shuttle buses.

(3) **Nuisance Noise** – UCSD will examine the use of smaller vehicles instead of the larger buses during later evening hours (especially after 10:00 p.m.) to reduce the nuisance noise adjacent to the shuttle routes and shuttle stop locations.

(4) **Trash** – UCSD will work with San Diego Transit to assure that adequate trash receptacles are available at all San Diego Transit/UCSD Cityshuttle stop locations.

(5) **Shuttle Bus Routes** – A preliminary assessment of existing routes will be completed prior to the start of operations in the fall of 2004. Route revisions suggested by commentors will be evaluated as part of this assessment. This examination will include operational considerations, safety, passenger demand, and the maintenance of adequate service levels.

(6) **Off-campus Parking** – Refer to Response O5-1.

(7) **Alternative Energy Shuttles** – UCSD operates one shuttle, which is fueled by compressed natural gas, and operates many smaller electric service vehicles on campus. Several years ago, UCSD also installed a number of electric vehicle charging stations on campus in key locations (in parking structures, etc) to promote electric vehicle use. UCSD is supportive of alternative fuel vehicles and will continue to monitor the market and explore feasible alternatives to traditional fuel service for shuttle vehicles.

(8) **Community Involvement** – UCSD acknowledges the requests of community members for greater information and involvement in decision-making regarding the Cityshuttle. Additional opportunities for community involvement will be provided.
This comment discusses the existing operations of the campus’s shuttle and not the proposed 2004 LRDP or the EIR. As discussed in Response O7-1, potential traffic, parking, noise, and air quality impacts associated with the proposed 2004 LRDP are discussed in the Draft EIR. Response O7-1 also identifies an approach that will be examined to address the concerns raised by the community related to the Cityshuttle service. Finally, Villa La Jolla Drive in the vicinity of Villas Mallorca is not a small residential street, it is a four-lane major roadway with left turn pocket lanes.
These introductory remarks summarize the issues that are discussed in more detail in the subsequent comments. Please refer to the corresponding responses to those comments.

The comment describes existing operations associated with the UCSD shuttle bus. The existing problems associated with students parking in the surrounding residential neighborhood is addressed in Section 4.13, Transportation, Traffic, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and discussed further in Response O7-1.

UCSD could not find a statement in the proposed 2004 LRDP and/or Draft EIR that claimed that the campus met with all communities. Because a specific reference to a section or page number is not provided, further response is not possible. As discussed in Response O27-2, UCSD has included extensive public involvement in the proposed 2004 LRDP and Draft EIR.

The comment discusses existing conditions associated with the UCSD shuttle bus. Existing shuttle bus operations are not a part of the proposed 2004 LRDP. Traffic, parking, and noise impacts are addressed in the Draft EIR. Transportation, traffic, and parking are discussed in Section 4.13 and noise is discussed in Section 4.9. The analyses in these sections are based on baseline studies, which consisted of traffic and parking counts, noise measurements, and modeling. Refer to Response O7-1 for additional discussion related to the existing and future operations of the UCSD shuttle buses.

The comment discusses a meeting that was held with UCSD staff and a request for an open forum for community discussion. No additional response is necessary. See also Response O7-1 for a discussion of proposed changes to the shuttle bus program.
The comment describes an existing condition associated with the UCSD shuttle bus. Refer to Response O7-1. The University is unaware of complaints from local commercial lots and looks forward to working with its neighbors on relevant issues.

The comment makes recommendations associated with the UCSD shuttle bus. See Response O7-1.

UCSD appreciates the commentor’s offer. Please refer to Response O7-1.

The 2004 LRDP and EIR are scheduled to be considered, along with all comments and responses, by The Regents at the September 2004 Regents meeting. All comments on the Draft EIR are provided to The Regents to inform their decision on the 2004 LRDP and EIR. Refer to Response O7-1 for further discussion.

The UCSD shuttle bus service has not only affected the residential community, but the business community as well. Michael Hull, Senior Manager of the La Jolla Village Square Mall and La Jolla Village Center has had to have his security constantly monitor their parking lots as Students park there to catch the shuttle - thus taking parking away from their customers. This is also happening in the business center on Holiday Court and across the street by El Torito and the Professional Business Center. We have also learned that the shuttle bus drivers are not checking for UCSD ID’s and thus ineligible people are using the shuttles for a free mode of transportation to get around.

We have proposed a simple solution to Milt Phegley that would re-route the buses to Gilman Drive only with pick up points on the west side and at the Gilman Park and Ride. This way the buses can then get back onto I-5 to go to UCSD or go east to University City. This would alleviate some of the noise issue. Quieter shuttles are also desperately needed. However, we would still have to find solutions to the parking problems that the shuttle bus brings.

Dale Disharoon and I would be happy to meet with you to discuss the neighborhood concerns and to find solutions to bring back the quality of life that we had before the UCSD shuttle buses began. Many of us have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to live in this community, and many are starting to re-locate because of the negative impact created by the shuttle bus service.

We request that no decision be reached at your upcoming UCSD Regents meeting in September to vote on your LRDP/EIR until the concerns of the community are alleviated. It is imperative that the resident homeowners are given equal opportunity to meet and express their concerns as other groups have been given. Our community has been a good neighbor to UCSD for many years and we ask that UCSD be a good neighbor in return. If you have any questions I can be reached at (858) 623-0175 or by email at JAMilgram@aol.com.

Thanks for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

Sandra M. Milgram
Chairperson, La Jolla Village Community Association

Cc: Councilman Scott Peters
Milt Phegley
Moises Aquirre
Catherine Presmyk
Dale Disharoon
Michael Hull
NAME: Capraro, Dominique
DATE: July 1, 2004

LRDP EIR COMMENTS:
I would like to say that the addition of the Cityshuttle has been an outstanding contribution to the success of students at UCSD. It is really reassuring to know that the university is taking the students’ needs to heart. I understand that there are a great deal of residence that have a negative impact from the implementation of the shuttle service but it is not nearly as dramatic as some would say. The shuttle is an alternative form of transportation that is relieving the congestion from in and around campus. It has also helped to alleviate the congestion on the public busses. It may have promoted more off-site parking, but most of that is occurring at the locations such as La Jolla Village Square. I live right by a stop and have that it has greatly helped. I would only ask that the intervals be every 1/2 an hour and that be at the peak hours with off hours being every 45 minutes.

HOPKINS PARKING STRUCTURE COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.

SAN DIEGO SUPERCOMPUTER EXPANSION COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.

RACY SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT FACILITY COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.
This comment discusses the existing operations of the campus's shuttle buses and activities of some students. As discussed in Response O7-1, potential traffic, parking, noise, and air quality impacts associated with the proposed 2004 LRDP are discussed in the Draft EIR. Response O7-1 also identifies an approach to address the concerns raised by the community related to the Cityshuttle service.
Dear Chancellor Fox,

I am writing to you as a resident homeowner in La Jolla Village of 19 years and a retired employee of UCSD with 37 plus years of service. I have had the opportunity of being a part of UCSD in its earliest days as well as moving into this community shortly after it became built out with condominiums and apartments. Since its inception, UCSD has always had a parking problem, i.e. nowhere near enough parking spaces to accommodate the number of vehicles that commute to the campus every day. According to the LRD/EIR draft report, the current ratio is 33,100 faculty, staff and students on campus to a total of 15,400 parking spaces. With these statistics it is not difficult to understand why every parking lot, parking structure and all street parking within 2-3 miles of campus have been invaded by UCSD students and staff who cannot find parking on campus or cannot afford to pay expensive parking fees. During the last three years, I have observed our neighborhood resident parking go from normal to crowded to impossible to find an empty space along almost all of our community streets from 9am to 6pm during week days starting last September through June 2004. In my opinion, our residential parking intrusion is directly related to a) the lack of adequate parking on campus, b) UCSD’s neighborhood shuttle service c) recent increases in tuition fees.

I understand that the University is currently facing large budget shortfalls as I was an employee during similar times at UCSD. However, I do believe that it is time for UCSD to meet its obligation to faculty, staff, students and our neighborhood to aggressively seek ways to provide adequate campus parking at reasonable fees. Also UCSD has an additional obligation to be a good neighbor to surrounding communities that continue to support its growth with generous gifts of money, volunteer time, and active participation in University sponsored events.

The ongoing intrusive parking of students and staff in our community has rapidly become a serious PR issue for UCSD. UCSD has the responsibility to provide services equal to its rapid growth and has been falling far short of its responsibility with regard to parking. UCSD’s parking lots can still be developed to be uniquely configured to meet its needs as it does not have the built out space problems of the UCSF or UCLA campuses. "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure" certainly applies to this issue if UCSD does not take remedial steps as soon as possible to make it much more feasible for the growing number of commuters to park on campus.

This comment discusses the use of off-campus neighborhood public parking by UCSD students and staff. The EIR addresses impacts to off-campus parking capacity in Section 4.13.3.2. Refer to Response O5-1 for further discussion.
The following are suggestions regarding remedial steps for your consideration:

Reduce annual parking fees for faculty, staff, and students to the actual cost per space for UCSD campus parking. The current parking fees seem unreasonably high.

Start charging a quarter a ride on the shuttle or take more money from student fees to fund the development of temporary parking lots on campus in the remaining open spaces. Also, every effort should be made to build more parking structures on campus as soon as funds are available.

Establish commuter parking lots. As you know, there are a large number of students living on campus who have parking stickers and use the inner campus parking lots as their garage from Monday through Friday. Thus many of the spaces in the central part of the campus are not available to commuters. Currently, it is just as convenient for commuters to park in the surrounding communities or business parking lots and then take the shuttle to campus. Scripps Clinic is in the process of changing their parking procedures because a recent survey found that a large number of UCSD students were parking in their urgently needed patient parking spaces throughout the past academic year.

Organize an open forum for all community members within the next month and another one during the next academic year so community members have an opportunity to give UCSD input regarding their personal experiences pertaining to our neighborhood parking issues.

Thank you for your consideration of this urgent matter.

Sincerely yours,

Nancy J. McLaughlin

Nancy J. McLaughlin
8370F Via Sonoma
La Jolla, CA 92037

Cc: Councilman Scott Peters
    Milt Phegley
    Moises Aquirre
    Catherine Presmyk
    Dale Disharoon
    Michael Hull

The commentor’s suggestions regarding remedial steps for reducing existing off-campus parking conditions in residential neighborhoods have been reviewed by UCSD and are addressed in Response O5-1. Refer to Response O7-1 for a discussion of forums for community input.
 COMMENTS

Mark Engel
8696 Villa La Jolla Drive Unit 3
La Jolla, CA 92037
(858) 677-6709
mark@engel.net

Monday, July 05, 2004

RE: UCSD master plan and adverse impacts of the city shuttle bus

Dear Ms. Presmgk:

Ever since UCSD started operating a shuttle bus in front of my home, there's been no street parking during the day. My neighborhood is just minutes from the UCSD campus and students avoid the cost and hassle of campus parking by monopolizing neighborhood streets. Sometimes, the students even use our condominium's visitor spaces. Also, the diesel buses are noisy, the riders litter, and some of the buses have dangerous drivers. This is unfair to me and my neighbors, and I'm upset that UCSD will is making the problem worse by expanding the shuttle bus program.

Campus parking is mismanaged, inconvenient and costly. With all the UCSD parking shenanigans and costly $6 daily parking fee, it is no wonder that so many choose to park in my neighborhood and take the shuttle buses instead. UCSD lots are usually full and the short-term metered parking spots are frequently reserved for special university guests. The university may claim it has adequate parking but the UCSD Guardian newspaper says otherwise--see the attached editorial. Not only does it report that parking is bad now but that the UCSD master plan will make campus parking even worse.

Rather than solve campus parking problems, UCSD is shifting its parking problems to the surrounding community by expanding the shuttle bus program. This is irresponsible and wrong.

I've sent a letter to Councilman Peters asking the City of San Diego to take a critical look at UCSD's shuttle program and reign-in the university by:

1. Deny UCSD construction permits for expansion until the university truly solves its parking problems.
2. Put a 2 hour limit on neighborhood parking surrounding the university except by neighborhood resident permit.
3. Deny UCSD permission to add additional shuttle bus stops and increase the frequency of the buses.

Sincerely,

Mark Engel

RESPONSES

O13-1 This comment addresses the existing operations of the campus's shuttle bus service and the potential expansion of this service. Other commentors have also identified impacts from this service to the surrounding community that currently exist. No new significant impacts were identified with the potential expansion of the shuttle bus service discussed in the Draft EIR. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required. However, UCSD will initiate measures to address existing and future inconveniences to the community from the shuttle buses as discussed in Response O7-1.
01 / 23 / 2003

Editorial

UCSD's parking plans need a twofold process

It is no secret that UCSD is straining to bust at the seams with students and their cars. Every year, UCSD admits more students than campus facilities can comfortably serve. The good news is that there is a plan to help expand this campus in order to accommodate students, staff and visitors. The bad news is that it may not actually improve life for undergraduate students at UCSD.

The UCSD Master Plan is a long-range vision for construction at UCSD. The plans contained within it are already well under way with new buildings springing up all over campus. As these buildings appear, "S" parking spaces disappear at an even greater rate, forcing more students to park on UCSD's inconvenient East Campus. But there is a method to the madness: It is all a part of the UCSD Master Plan. According to the plan, by the year 2005, all undergraduate parking will be on East Campus.

There is already a great deal of parking on East Campus. The students who choose to park there are making a trade-off: In exchange for parking, they are sacrificing the safety of their cars and their contents, as well as the possibility of spending less than 20 minutes getting to class after arriving at school.

If the administration plans to eventually move all undergraduate parking to this remote part of campus, it needs to do two things. First, the administration needs to plan for increased security in this part of campus so students don't have to worry about their cars being stolen while they are in class. Second, the administration needs to plan to expand and improve the shuttle system. Shuttles will have to run to every lot on East Campus, and they will need to run 24 hours a day because of the aforementioned safety issue. Many students stay on campus studying or working with student organizations after the East Campus parking shuttles stop running at 1:15 a.m.

With these considerations, the UCSD Master Plan can fulfill its potential to make UCSD a more convenient place for higher learning.
From: Sarah Gille [mailto:sgille@ucsd.edu]
Sent: Monday, July 05, 2004 7:23 AM
To: Phegley, Milton J.
Subject: UCSD long range development plan

Dear Milt Phegley,

I'm writing to comment on the long-range development plan that UCSD has posted to the web. Unfortunately my husband and I were unable to attend the public hearing on June 14. We remain very interested in the long-range plan, both because we are UCSD faculty (my husband, Stefan Llewellyn Smith, is in MAE; I have a joint appointment in MAE and at SIO), and also because we are neighbors to the university (we live at 9551 Poole Street).

We have an 8 month old baby, and many of the faculty who have recently been hired in our departments also have young children or are beginning to plan families. Thus we are particularly excited at the prospect of UCSD establishing a second day care facility near Coast Apartments. I was disappointed to see that the long-range plan includes little specific information about the day care. We wholeheartedly support its construction.

We understand from earlier discussions that entry would be from Expedition Drive, and not from the residential streets, Poole and Azul. In addition, we understand that the undeveloped corridor parallel to Azul and along the canyon will be retained, allowing continued pedestrian access between Poole Street and the parkland. We hope that this will also allow pedestrian access to the day care facility, both from Scripps and from the UCSD main campus.

Please feel free to contact us if you have questions about our interests or concerns. We will be out of town, on sabbatical, through March, but will be available via e-mail.

Best regards,

Sarah Gille

---

Sarah Gille  sgille@ucsd.edu  

UCSD appreciates the commentor's interest in future building projects, particularly childcare projects. The proposed 2004 LRDP and the Draft EIR provide "programmatic" analyses of potential development on the campus, not detailed project information for reasons discussed in Response S2-1. Project specifics will be available at the time the project is proposed, and the campus encourages you to participate in the process for those projects when they arise.
The commentor raises concerns about past storage and curation of archaeological artifacts from UCSD. These allegations do not result from the proposed 2004 LRDP or Draft EIR and thus are beyond the scope of the EIR. However, UCSD is currently investigating the claims made in this comment, has secured funding for assessment and curation of artifacts in the University’s possession, and is reviewing various funding options to provide for storage of these artifacts, where required by the state and federal Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Acts (NAGPRA). UCSD takes its obligations under NAGPRA seriously and UCSD will continue to work with the Department of Interior advisory committee and with the University Advisory Group on Cultural Affiliation and Repatriation of Human Remains and Cultural Items regarding Native American remains and associated cultural objects in its collections by reviewing existing documentation. Because it is federal and state law, UCSD will comply with NAGPRA when implementing the 2004 LRDP and language has been added to the Draft EIR, Section 4.4, to clarify that NAGPRA compliance will occur. It is University policy to draw on the best available academic expertise and involve consultation with tribal authorities representing Native American groups. Inventories include descriptions of human remains and associated cultural objects and, to the extent possible, identify the geographical and cultural affiliation of those human remains and associated cultural items, as required by NAGPRA.

Refer to Response O15-1.
The DEIR appropriately states that additional cultural resources are bound to be encountered during development. Cultural resources will likely be found in those areas developed before 1971 when the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was enacted and assessment for cultural resources was required. Our experience as a designated federal repository curating artifacts from military bases suggests that Camp Callan and Camp Matthews will have significant cultural resources, especially with the increasing interest in WWII sites.

The report mentions that many sites have been "disturbed" and underwent previous excavation. However, their potential significance should not be discounted. Since so few collections have been curated and made available for continued research, what remains is even more important now. In addition, thought should be given to better monitoring of these sites to ensure that they are not subject to human impacts, such as digging for fill dirt, landscaping practices or illegal "pot-hunting."

In Section 4.4.36 vi we are very happy to see that curation is included in the mitigation plan. Since federal monies will be used for this project, it "federalizes" the project and curation would be required under Curation of Federally-Owned and Administered Archeological Collections [36 CFR Part 79]. This regulation mandates the curation collections required by NHPA, the Reservoir Salvage Act and ARPA. This regulation also spells out the requirements of a qualified repository, which precludes an unprotected warehouse.

One state cultural resource protection law not mentioned in the DEIR is the Native American Historical, Cultural, and Sacred Sites Act of 2001 [PRC 5097.995-9097.996]. This act states that no public agency, and no private party using or occupying public property, or operating on public property, under a public license, permit, grant, lease, or contract made on or after July 1, 1977, shall in any manner whatsoever interfere with the free expression or exercise of Native American religion as provided in the United States Constitution and the California Constitution; nor shall any such agency or party cause severe or irreparable damage to any Native American sanctified cemetery, place of worship, religious or ceremonial site, or sacred shrine located on public property, except on a clear and convincing showing that the public interest and necessity so require.

Finally, the mission of UCSD is to educate. The cultural resources that may be recovered as a result of the LRDP could be used in educational and interpretive programs, both on the campus and in the community. The San Diego Archaeological Center would like to extend an offer to assist UCSD in this effort.

Thank you for including these comments in the official record of the LRDP DEIR. Please include the San Diego Archaeological Center in the distribution list for further reports.

Sincerely,

Cindy Stankowski
Director
San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc.

Environmental Review Committee

7 July 2004

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: Draft Environmental Impact Report
2004 Long Range Development Plan

Dear Mr. Steindorf:

I have reviewed the cultural resources aspects of the subject DEIR on behalf of this committee of the San Diego County Archaeological Society.

Based on the information contained in the DEIR, we have the following comments:

O16-1

(1) Testing and/or salvage excavation has taken place at a significant number of the archaeological sites listed in Section 4.4 of the DEIR, some of it as recently as 1998. The University should locate each of these collections and, for those not presently curated, take the necessary actions to have them:

- Reviewed for compliance with the federal Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) and the corresponding California NAGPRA,
- Upgraded to current standards, and
- Curated, along with the associated records, at an institution meeting the requirements of 36 CFR 79.

We note that the Register of Professional Archaeologists’ Code of Ethics requires curation, but the University needs to provide the funding for it and the appropriate title transfer for the archaeologists to comply. Please advise the University’s intentions for inventorying its archaeological collections and bringing them into compliance with the above.

O16-2

(2) While this DEIR addresses actions to be taken to ensure proper treatment of cultural resources in the project area for future development projects, the damage to several sites noted in Section 4.4 suggests a need for more active monitoring of the condition of the sites. Archaeological sites should not be used as sources of fill material, nor should they be the locations of unmonitored landscaping activities. And beyond these human impacts, there is a need for periodic monitoring of the sites for deterioration through

O16-3

Refer to Response O15-1.

Refer to Response O15-1. This comment discusses funding and administrative matters relating to curation. These are beyond the scope of the 2004 LRDP EIR, however it is University policy to comply with all applicable laws and regulations. To the extent that this comment raises a legal obligation, the campus will comply with applicable regulations.

Refer to Responses O15-1 and O15-4. Actions taken prior to state legislation may have resulted in the loss of cultural resources located on campus. Since legislation was passed, the interpretation of adequate compliance has undergone substantial change, so that actions undertaken today on behalf of UCSD could be substantially different from those undertaken with similar goals in the past.

UCSD has prepared an updated (2004) LRDP for consideration by The Regents, to guide development on the campus for the next 15 years. Commensurate with this effort, UCSD undertook additional environmental review, and identified steps to be taken during future environmental review tasks over the life of the 2004 LRDP. Potential significant impacts to cultural resources are addressed in several mitigation measures in the Draft EIR (including Cul-1E, Cul-1F, Cul-2A, Cul-2B, Cul-2C, Cul-2D, and Cul-2E). These measures ensure that potentially significant but unknown resources within proposed project footprints are appropriately assessed for significance and feasible mitigation implemented to reduce potentially significant impacts.

Similarly, UCSD’s current mandatory design requirements are anticipated to lessen erosional effects associated with campus development to less than significant levels. No ongoing monitoring (i.e., monitoring that exceeds construction-period monitoring) is considered necessary.
UCSD agrees that landscaping can be an integral part of a cultural setting. During review of historic resources in accordance with mitigation measure Cul-1B and the preceding discussion under Standards of Significance, the architectural historian would be able to consult with a landscape architect, as appropriate, regarding important historic structures and associated landscape features. However, there is no evidence to support a requirement for a landscape architect to review every project area.

The Regulatory Framework discussion of Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, of the Draft EIR has been amended to include references to the federal and state Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Acts (NAGPRA).

UCSD believes that the level of analysis contained in the Draft EIR is appropriate for a Program EIR and it does not preclude, but rather facilitates through lists and detailed mitigation measures, proactive identification of significant structures prior to project proposals. In addition, the reasons and rationale behind finding a structure important may change over time. It is not helpful to “pre-analyze” why a structure may hold value in advance of the need to do so. UCSD believes that by identifying campus locales containing structures of potential significance/importance, and providing a list of buildings, with notations regarding build years to trigger review, an appropriate level of review has been completed, with additional work to follow.

It is important to note that the curation requirements contained in 39 CFR 79, cited by the commenter, only apply to collections, “that are excavated or removed under the authority of the Antiquities Act (16 U.S.C. 431-433), the Reservoir Salvage Act (16 U.S.C. 469-469c), Section 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470h-2) or the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 470aa-mm). Such collections generally include those that are the result of a prehistoric or historic resources survey, excavation or other study conducted in connection with a federal action, assistance, license or permit.” Mitigation measures typically do not repeat federal or state legal requirements, since the University is obligated to follow those requirements even without a mitigation measure. Thus, the University has added this regulatory requirement to the Regulatory Framework section of Section 4.4 of the Draft EIR and left the mitigation measure as is.

The cited memorandum was referenced and available upon request during public review. The memorandum has been sent to the commenter (see Attachment 1).
For the attention of the Regents of the University of California
For the attention of the Chancellor of the University of California
For the attention of the Vice Chancellor, Administration, of the University of California
San Diego
For the attention of the campus planners of the University of California, San Diego
For the attention of the City Manager, the City Government of San Diego
For the attention of Council member Scott Peters, District One Representative in the City
of San Diego
For the attention of Mr. Kevin Guy, City of San Diego planner for the area of La Jolla

From Susan (Sue) Moore
8944 Nottingham Place
La Jolla
CA 92037
7/07/04
sue@mind.ucsd.edu

To whom it may concern:


Before embarking on some comments with respect to the primary document I would like to make the following observations based on the UCSD/LRDP EIR 1989. It is important, I believe, to set projects in their historical context, to clearly identify where the goals of that project have been met, or have failed to have been met, and to ensure that the legal constraints of the historical plan have been met, to the letter of the law before considering the next phase of a project.

(All references for this section are taken from the UCSD LRDP EIR for 1989)

Detailed review of the UCSD/LRDP DEIR 1989 has yielded more questions than it has answered. The primary question that must be answered by University of California

O17-1

Refer to Attachment 2, Summary of Implementation of 1989 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures and Response O18-1.

In response to the commenter’s housing comment, accommodating 50 percent of students in campus housing was the long-range objective in the 1989 LRDP, with a commitment to accommodate at least 38 percent of students in campus housing. Since 1989, the campus has developed approximately 2,290 additional housing beds comprising almost one million gross square feet at a cost of 149 million dollars. Currently, two new campus housing projects are being planned to provide approximately 1,800 additional housing beds by 2008-09 at a cost of more than 180 million dollars. Like the 1989 LRDP, the 2004 LRDP identifies campus land for housing and will look at financially feasible opportunities to reach the long-term goal of providing housing for up to 50 percent of the student population. Refer also to Response L3-2.

In addition, the commenter raises a concern about public schools. Public schools are addressed in Draft EIR Section 4.11, Public Services.
Regents, the planners and legal staff of UCSD, and the relevant partners in the City of San Diego government is whether or not the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the UCSD LRDP EIR (page 10) has been met under the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). It would appear, both from communication and lack of it, by representatives of the UCSD campus planners, that the requirement “Monitoring of these measures will be accomplished through verification and certification by campus personnel currently responsible for the administration of CEQA” has not been fulfilled. There is no need to itemize the possibly unmet mitigation measures because recent interactions in public meetings with UCSD planners has resulted in the violation of the following requirement that “The Campus Planning Office will be the focus for monitoring of mitigation measures called for in the LRDP EIR. A yearly report of monitoring status for all three types of mitigation measures will be made to the Vice Chancellor, Administration, with appropriate background information supplied by responsible campus units. These monitoring reports will be available to the public upon request.” (Bold added, page 21.)

The latter obligation remains unmet by the UCSD campus planners.

Having written that there is no need to itemize the unmet mitigations I would like to take the opportunity to note several that I know remain unmet.

Anyone who lives near UCSD and who watches the inner residential streets fill up from Doyle Park at Regents Road (convenient for the users of the UCSD Shuttle) to the Villa La Jolla area (convenient all day parking in the residential streets for the users of the UCSD shuttle), and the area closest to the campus at La Jolla Scenic Drive North, Cliffridge Avenue, Glenbrook Way, and Nottingham Place, to say nothing of the security personnel needed at local shopping and restaurant lots (Radisson Hotel, La Jolla Village Square, El Torito and the La Jolla Professional Building) will see that Mitigation Measures 3.1.3.5(b); 3.1.3.5(c); 3.2.2.3; 3.4.2.3(a); 3.4.2.3(b) have not been mitigated! Indeed, the increase in UCSD’s traffic and the increased need for parking are identified in the 2004 LRDP EIR. If one looks at the current noise levels in the 2004 plan it is quite clear that the 1989 levels have not been met, and now will be exceeded.

Comments 1-24, 1-26 and 1-27 on page 47 of the UCSD LRDP EIR 1989 read:
1-24 “The DEIR acknowledges that the Revised Long Range Development Plan will have significant, specific, and cumulative traffic impacts that cannot be fully mitigated.”

1-26.1 In previous actions and through this Long Range Development Plan and Environmental Impact Report, UCSD continues to be a regional leader in areas including transportation alternatives and the preservation of open space. It is hoped that the acknowledgement in this EIR of UCSD’s incremental contribution to regional impacts, such as traffic circulation and air quality, and the identification of significant cumulative impact will serve as a catalyst for the solution of these impacts.”

1-27 “UCSD is committed to an ongoing communications program with its neighbors. This program is coordinated primarily through the Office of University Relations.”

I would offer that 1-24 is being compounded by the UCSD LRDP EIR, 2004, and that although UCSD has special privileges as a California State entity on its own acreage those privileges should end at the boundary with the City. That is, that UCSD’s impacts should not encroach in their unmitigable form on residents of the City of San Diego.

1-26 a simple comment. UCSD has not furthered the progress of the LRT system, neither has it made any noticeable public effort to endorse, support and fund alternative transportation methods beyond a few shuttles and some preferential parking passes for occasional users of bicyclists. (Many of whom park their cars in the interior residential streets, unhook their bikes from the rack on the back of the vehicle and sally forth to class — I know, they park daily for up to 12 hours and on occasion all weekend in front of our house.) And yes, residents to complain to the relevant officials.

1-27— Mr. Milt Phegley is recognized within the community as the only interface between the university and the residents. There is no obvious manifestation of this assertion: “UCSD is committed to an ongoing communications program with its neighbors. This program is primarily coordinated through the Office of University Relations.” In reality, neighbors are “told” what is happening. The only meaningful
interaction with the community took place over Seaweed Canyon and the potential move of the machine shop...having attended a key meeting during that public relations fiasco I can only add that I hope that the Office of University Relations has undergone some personnel training or changes. It is to the credit of Mr. Phegley that local residents have any knowledge of UCSD’s plans and the opportunity to provide input. (Deflected, ignored...though that input may be!)

With respect to the transportation alternatives, in a response to Mr. Ron Roberts (current San Diego Mayoral candidate) the following was written:

“New language emphasizing the San Diego Trolley has been included in the Draft Revised Long Range Development Plan” (page 74, in response to letter from Mr. Roberts to then UCSD Chancellor Richard Atkinson, pp.72-72).

If only that emphasis was not in spirit alone!

Again, with respect to the LRT (that I believe was partially a victim of UCSD’s own employees):

In a letter from Patricia Collum in UCSD’s Campus Planning Office, dated October 16th, 1989, to Marilyn Cox the emphasis on the LRT for the 1989 – 2004 planning period

“The following language emphasizing the proposed LRT has been inserted on page 64:

In the future, Light Rail Transit (trolley) service will be provided to the northern areas of San Diego. Given its commitment to encouraging the use of mass transit, UCSD has been working with the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) to evaluated alternative routes for effectively serving the campus. The University’s preferred alignment runs along the Interstate 5 corridor and would enable development of a UCSD station adjacent to a proposed pedestrian bridge over the freeway, that would allow pedestrians to walk to destinations on both the central and eastern segments of the campus. Also, to increase the convenience and attractiveness of using this important mode of alternative transportation, UCSD will coordinate deployment of its campus shuttles with Light Rail Transit operations” (page 123).
I realize that it may seem as though I am belabouring a point – I am, and for good reason. It is easy to make promises, to appease people, and hope they go away. As the response to the UCSD LRDP EIR 2004 “Scoping meetings” and community written and e-mailed comments makes evident, the University City and La Jolla communities are now fully engaged in this planning process, therefore the failure by UCSD (the UC Regents, and all involved) to deliver even on the mitigation measures reports, let alone the mitigations themselves allows the benign Madame Defarge’s of today to document the process and gain access to the community and legal resources that are necessary to protect homes and lives. Knitting needles may well have given way to computers, but the metaphor holds.

With respect to the mitigation measures that are the responsibility of the City of San Diego, I trust that the City Manager will provide community members with a full report, on request, of the success or not of the joint and sole mitigation measures of UCSD and the City of San Diego government.

In the UCSD LRDP EIR 1989, UCSD provides a justification for the expansion in the sense that certain goals of this public university have been determined and the LRDP is necessary to accomplish those goals. Specifically I request UC and UCSD documentation of the status of the following goals.

2-16, 5: To recruit and retain a highly qualified and ethnically diverse student body and faculty;

2-16, 6 To develop programs to encourage students, especially those from underrepresented minorities, to pursue graduate and professional training.

Housing – UCSD clearly has not achieved the 50% housing goal, therefore the worst-case scenario is in effect – a worst case scenario without achievement of mitigation measures (recently described as “vanilla” by a campus official). Before the new UCSD LRDP EIR 2004 is certified, a financial feasibility plan to guarantee 50% student housing on campus should be developed, guaranteed, and presented at a future public meeting. Since UCSD
Section 4.11.3.3. of the Draft EIR provides a detailed discussion of potential impacts to public schools from implementation of the 2004 LRDP. This section includes numeric data on school enrollment based on personal communications with the San Diego Unified School District (SDUSD), existing and future demand associated with UCSD, a discussion of Proposition MM projects, and a multiplier that is applied to estimate future demand from UCSD. The section concludes that significant impacts to public schools would not occur. CEQA does not require assignment of mitigation measures for "unlikely" impacts as suggested by the commentor. Please also refer to Comment Letter L1 from SDUSD.
**COMMENTS**

4.11 Fire and Police protection. The language in the current DEIR is quite different from that of 1989. What increase in emergency service personnel will be required to meet the increased potential demand for emergency services as a consequence of the increased population generated by UCSD’s students, faculty, staff and “visitors” to the campus? Who will provide the funding for the additional services and/or what services will be weakened as a consequence of the additional growth? Indeed, were the mitigation measures from 1989 met? If so, how? If not, why not and how can UCSD propose an increased strain on resources (albeit not from environmental impact of new facilities)?

4.12

4.13 Again – this is meaningless.

4.14 Alarming.

4.15 This is purely semantics. Currently, according to UCSD Parking Services, UCSD sells approximately twice as many parking permits than spaces provided. Inadequate parking is already an issue (see the number of cars in the local neighbourhoods with current UCSD parking permits in view).

4.9 Noise – please explain to the community in the areas adjacent to UCSD why the Potentially Significant Transportation Noise does not require mitigation?

**RESPONSES**

O17-3

The 2004 LRDP Draft EIR and the 1989 LRDP EIR differ substantially because the EIRs analyze different proposed projects with different environmental settings, or baseline, conditions. Thus, it would be expected that the discussions in the EIRs differ. Fire protection is discussed in Section 4.11.3.1 and police protection is addressed in Section 4.11.3.2 of the Draft EIR. These sections discuss potential increases in demand on these services and include some discussions of related funding. Discussion of expected population increases is provided in Section 4.10, Population and Housing, and Section 5.2, Growth Inducement, in the Draft EIR. The EIR concludes that, development occurring under the proposed 2004 LRDP would not be likely to result in a significant increase in demand for off-campus fire or police services. Refer to Response O18-1 regarding 1989 LRDP EIR mitigation measures.

The commentor does not specify what is “meaningless” or “alarming” and, therefore, a response is not possible. Parking permits pay for parking facilities and shuttle operations. The more permits sold result in lower permit fees, which encourages use, and more financial resources to build additional parking supply and expand shuttle services. Students, faculty, and staff use campus facilities on different days and times, and each permit holder does not need a parking space 24 hours per day seven days per week. In addition, visitors to the campus come at various days and times, typically for short periods of time. Consequently, correlating the number of parking permits with the number of spaces is not an appropriate method of assessing parking availability. Rather, an inventory of parking space demand is counted and reported on each quarter by the campus. In the most recent report (Spring 2004) overall 17 percent of available campus parking spaces were empty during the highest average peak hourly demand. Refer to Response O5-1 for additional discussion.

This comment appears to be referring to the Noise Cumulative Issue Summary box on page 4.9-30 of the Draft EIR, which indicates the potential for significant cumulative transportation noise impacts. This table also indicates that the 2004 LRDP’s contribution to this impact was not cumulatively considerable. This is a summary of the discussion in Section 4.9.4.2 of the Draft EIR and the location of the potential significant cumulative impacts are detailed in Table 4.9-5 of the Draft EIR. As explained in Section 4.9.4.2, the project’s contribution to a cumulative noise impact would not be cumulatively considerable and, therefore, would not require mitigation.

Parking is sited to best serve people that need reasonable access to destinations or living quarters on campus such as the campus’s academic and residential areas. The 1989 LRDP and the 2004 LRDP provide for the development of parking structures at select locations on-campus. The San Diego
A final comment:

Please consider the number of impacts on the neighbouring communities and simply consider how the quality of life for the residents is being degraded. The earlier LRDPs for UCSD did not predict (1981 in particular) the density and impacts of UCSD on the neighbouring communities and the community plans do not provide for the extent of expansion that UCSD is now proposing as a consequence of the change in direction that took place during the 1980s.

Thank you

Sue Moore

Submitted by e-mail to UCSD planners in compliance with the 7/09/04 deadline.

Letters via USPS sent at a later date for informational purpose only.

RESPONSES

Supercomputer project would displace parking in the area that would be replaced and augmented with new parking from the Hopkins Parking Structure. Currently, shuttles provide access from existing perimeter surface lots to the center of campus, and other shuttles provide access along the campus loop road.

The Draft EIR addresses project impacts in all areas affected by campus development contemplated in the proposed 2004 LRDP. Of particular note are Sections 4.8 Land Use and Planning, 4.9 Noise, 4.10 Population and Housing, 4.11 Public Services, and 4.13 Transportation, Traffic, and Parking. The EIR for each of the earlier LRDPs evaluated the potential impacts of campus growth. The level of campus development proposed in the 1989 LRDP was consistent with the City of San Diego’s University Community Plan (adopted in 1987). The campus development proposed in the 2004 LRDP and evaluated in the Draft EIR is also consistent with the University and La Jolla Community Plans, as addressed in Section 4.8.2.3 of the Draft EIR.
As requested by the commentor, public review was extended to July 23, 2004 (See Attachment 1). The Draft EIR evaluates the potentially significant impacts of the proposed 2004 LRDP. An analysis of individual items contained in the 15-year old 1989 LRDP and 1989 LRDP EIR is beyond the scope of this EIR. Nevertheless, Attachment 2 contains a summary of the implementation of mitigation measures that were identified in the 1989 UCSD LRDP EIR. The mitigation monitoring plan described in the 1989 LRDP EIR consisted of three categories: 1) mitigation measures related to the implementation of future campus projects, 2) mitigation measures related to maintaining adequate service levels, and 3) administrative measures, independent of specific projects, defined to mitigate certain potential impacts. The specific mitigation measures within the above categories that were identified in the 1989 EIR are reiterated in the attached table along with summaries of the status of those mitigation measures. Contrary to this comment, this table demonstrates that mitigation compliance with the 1989 EIR has been very successful.

The University monitors mitigation measures that are outside of the University’s jurisdiction, such as those that are the responsibility of the City of San Diego, including water, sewer, and transportation projects, with UCSD’s Campus Community Planner providing campus coordination and liaison. The Campus Community Planner sits as a member of the University Community Planning Group executive committee and also participates in the City’s Facilities Benefit Assessment (FBA) oversight committee.

With regard to UCSD meetings with City of San Diego representatives concerning off-campus issues, the following summary is provided. Although the campus has never maintained a list or log of contacts with the City of San Diego, please note that communication with various City staff has occurred regularly over the past 15 years to discuss off-campus mitigation measures. For the most part, those discussions have focused on FBA projects that have been identified to reduce traffic impacts. Also, to maintain communication between UCSD and local agencies regarding various off-campus issues, UCSD staff have worked on an on-going basis with the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) in planning for a light rail extension that will serve the campus, as well as other mass transit improvements planned to serve our community; e.g., the community loop shuttle, bus rapid transit, etc. Regular contact and coordination also occurs with a number of other agencies, including Caltrans, California Coastal Commission, California Department of Fish and Game, San Diego Transit, and the North County Transit District.

See also Response O5-1 with regard to parking and Responses O25-2, -4, and -5 with regard to off-campus “institutions serving students.”
Mitigation Monitoring Plan states: "The Campus Planning Office will be the focus for monitoring of mitigation measures called for in the LRDP EIR. A yearly report of monitoring status for all three types of mitigation measures will be made to the Vice Chancellor, Administration, with appropriate background information supplied by responsible campus units. These monitoring reports will be available to the public upon request." The 1989 LRDP, p.122, 15-15, states "A mitigation monitoring program (as required by Public Resources Code Section 21081.6) is included as a component of the Final Environmental Impact Report. Monitoring reports will be available upon request, to any individual, group, or agency."

The UCSD mitigation monitoring document further states that since CEQA requires lead agencies to develop procedures to ensure implementation of mitigation measures, specific mitigation monitoring procedures were implemented. It is significant to note that the document includes the following provision: "To encourage timely action" (on infrastructure and off-campus mitigation) "and to ensure the timely provision of University coordination, University representatives will meet at least once a year with City representatives to review progress and discuss results. The University will provide analytical data as needed to assist in the timely implementation of off-campus mitigation."

Thus, we respectfully request a comprehensive summary of mitigation monitoring results, including a list of 1989 LRDP unmet mitigations and adequate reports from meetings between UCSD and the City of San Diego about ongoing off-campus mitigation issues.

Residents of La Jolla are significantly impacted by the on-going expansion of the University. The blatant encroachment by institutions serving UCSD students, extending into open space parkland and residential property in a single family zoned neighborhood adjacent to the campus, is the most recent egregious example. Ever increasing off campus student and staff parking poses safety issues, increased trash and inconvenience to the residents. UCSD must not only accept responsibility for the problems created in our neighborhoods and on our residential streets as a result of the swelling campus population, but they must provide acceptable solutions.

The La Jolla Community Planning Association sincerely appreciates the efforts that UCSD is making to improve its relationship with our community. However, the effectiveness of UCSD to meet the mitigations of the prior plan has a direct bearing on the degree of likelihood that UCSD will effectively mitigate the proposed expansion in the 2004 LRDP. Thus, we need your further cooperation in providing data essential for diligent review by the surrounding community before the deadline for public review for the EIR.

We anticipate a prompt response to this request for information and an appropriate extension of the deadline for the public review period for the EIR.

Sincerely,
Simon Andrews, LJ CPA Chair
Mary Coakley, LJ CPA Secretary
(619) 840-0250
coaakleym@san.rr.com
Please forward correspondence to: La Jolla Community Planning Association
ATTN: Mary Coakley, Secretary
P.O. Box 889
La Jolla, CA 92037
(619) 840-0250
coaakleym@san.rr.com

CC: Stan Siegel, UCPG Chair
Mayor Dick Murphy
Councilmember Scott Peters
Steven W. Relyea, UCSD Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs
Jeffrey A. Steindorf, UCSD Assistant Vice Chancellor Campus Planning
James M. Langley, UCSD Vice Chancellor External Relations
Milt Phegley, UCSD Planning
Catherine Presnyk, UCSD Planning

Please NOTE:
Milt Phegley’s email dated July 7, 2004

-----Original Message-----
From: Phegley, Milton J. [mailto:mphegley@ucsd.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, July 07, 2004 7:37 AM
To: Penelope Bourk (E-mail)
Cc: Cathy Presnyk (E-mail):2
Subject: 1989 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

Attached is a table detailing the 53 mitigation measures identified for
monitoring and reporting in the 1989 UCSD Long Range Development Plan
Environmental Impact Report. We acknowledge the absence, at present, of
a comprehensive report detailing the implementation of these mitigation
measures. We also acknowledge the need to complete such a report as
soon as possible. I regret that we were not able to do this in the timely
manner which I thought would be possible and that I had promised to you.
Please contact me if you have any questions. Milt

Milton J. Phegley, AICP
Campus Community Planner
Government and Community Relations
University of California, San Diego
858-534-5782 (phone) 858-534-2998 (fax)
e-mail: mphegley@ucsd.edu
Mailing address:
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA 92037-0993

Delivery Address:
10300 N. Torrey Pines Rd. (FirstFloor)
La Jolla, CA 92037-1020

***1989 Mitigation Measures Summary available from LJ CPA upon request.***
This comment discusses the existing operations of the campus’s shuttle buses and not the proposed 2004 LRDP or the EIR. As discussed in Response O7-1, potential traffic, parking, noise, and air quality impacts associated with the proposed 2004 LRDP are discussed in the Draft EIR. Response O7-1 also identifies an approach that UCSD has identified to address the concerns raised by the community related to the Cityshuttle service.
Dear Mr. Steindorf,

The La Jolla Town Council works proactively as a unifying voice on behalf of the entire La Jolla community. The La Jolla Town Council requests an extension of time for the public review period of the Draft EIR for the UCSD Long Range Development Plan currently scheduled to end July 9, 2004. The extension would be co-terminus with the extension requested by the La Jolla Community Planning Association.

Since the Long Range Development Plan will provide the basis for future decisions concerning land use and capital projects, our community needs to be fully informed. A request for how the University has mitigated past impacts of its growth under the previous plan of 1989 has not been answered. An accounting of successful mitigation efforts, as well as the unachievable goals of the last 15 years, will allow the community and the University to realistically assess the mitigation proposed in the 2004 Draft EIR.

As the premier educational institution in the State of California, the University must take extra measures to fully inform concerned citizens in a transparent process. The University’s inability to provide information that would assist our Land Use Committee’s deliberations and response to the Long Range Development Plan prior to the deadline creates an opportunity for the logical response, to extend that deadline.

We too look forward to the predicted growth of the University to meet its mandated role in the state educational master plan. The La Jolla Town Council recognizes that our community can benefit from the best management practices of a prominent neighbor.

Very truly yours,

Robert Collins
La Jolla Town Council President

cc.
Regents of the University of California
Mayor Dick Murphy, City of San Diego
Council District 1 Scott Peters

UCSD extended the public review period to those who requested it, including this commentor, to July 23, 2004. Also, see Response O18-1 and Attachment 2, Summary of Implementation of 1989 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures.
July 8, 2004

Mr. Jeffrey A. Steindorf, Assistant Vice Chancellor Campus Planning
University of California, San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive, MC 0965
San Diego, CA 92093-0965

RE: Review of Draft 2004 LRDP EIR – UCSD
From: University Community Planning Group (UCPG) Comments and Response

Dear Mr. Steindorf,

WHEREAS, the University Community Plan provides a balance of planning policy elements including residential, (including a high density urban node), commercial and industrial development, open space and recreation, supported by a careful analysis of the vehicular traffic and availability of mass transit, and

WHEREAS, it was anticipated that allowable development would proceed within the community at a pace supported by the transportation infrastructure and proposed transit improvements, and

WHEREAS, within Table 2-2 Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures of the UCSD LRDP EIR there are two issues that are identified as significant and unmitigatable. These being:

4.9 Noise and pollution exceeding current community standards in the City of San Diego
4.13 Transportation, Traffic, and Parking – Regional decreases in traffic level of service. And

WHEREAS, the urban node is situated South of Eastgate Mall and north of Nobel Drive, and clustered along the east-west thoroughfares of La Jolla Village Drive and Nobel Drive, between the UCSD campus and I-805, and

WHEREAS, UCSD is not in the position to implement off-site mitigation and

WHEREAS, UCSD does not contribute to the North University City Facilities Benefit Assessment (FAB) account, but benefits directly from the expenditures of money from (FBA) account, UCSD should make it a top priority to provide valuable in-kind design/technical services to solve the issues raised.

WHEREAS, San Diego City Council Policy 600-34 mandates that transit facilities and services be an integral part of the planning/community plan process, and that all appropriate planning, right-of-way protection and acquisition, funding of transit facilities construction, operation and maintenance, and inter-jurisdiction coordination actions be taken to facilitate transit development and
COMMENTS

O21-1 (cont.)

WHEREAS, according to Council Policy 600-34, effective May 20, 1986, “Section 3 – Funding of Transit Construction Facilities, Operation and Maintenance A. Whether acting on its own or in concert with MTDB and/or other agencies, the City shall aggressively pursue all available opportunities for federal and state transit funding assistance. And B. Council-approved transit alignments and stations shall be incorporated into community public facilities financing plans (FBA). Where appropriate, the City shall utilize development agreements, development fees, and/or ordinances to allow for in-lieu fees, special assessment districts, air rights leasing, and other such mechanisms to obtain transit funding.”

California Government Code, Section 61600-61601.28 gives community financing benefit area’s broad jurisdiction and powers to implement transportation services/facilities that are feasible, economically sound and in the public interest, and

WHEREAS, transit alignments and facilities have not previously been incorporated into the North University City Facilities Benefit Assessment (FBA) program and FBA funding has not been provided for such facilities, resulting in shortfalls in funding for project implementation, and

WHEREAS, the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) of UCSD anticipates an increase in student, faculty, and support population, with anticipated significant additional demands/impacts on commuter traffic, use of single occupancy vehicles on local streets and regional interstates, and a greater need for mass transit. One or more of the following means should be considered to improve or increase transit capability, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Light Rail Transit (LRT), Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), hydrogen shuttle buses, Super loop, Coaster station at Nobel Drive between Towne Centre Drive and Shoreline Drive, local shuttle, High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes on the interstates, and planned improvements at intersections, turn lanes, highway interchanges, interstate access, and improvements on I-5 and I-805, and

WHEREAS, new, unrelated development is also planned in the North University Subarea in compliance with the Community Plan, and additional proposals for Community Plan amendments are under consideration by the local planning group which anticipate increases in Average Daily Trips (ADT’s), and, the Greater University Community Area is becoming an increasingly greater employment destination,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the proposed EIR review of the UCSD Long Range Development Plan consider the phasing of the anticipated population growth and planned increase in habitable square footage monitored under CEQA guidelines and required mitigation to lessen cumulative and direct impacts, and off-street parking for single rider and low occupancy vehicles with the planned but not yet operational components of the transportation infrastructure including joint operating agreements with non-UCSD authorities designed to increase capacity/storage

RESPONSES

O21-2

This comment recommends that development occurring under the 2004 LRDP EIR be phased or timed based on offsite transit improvements. Development and transportation improvement phasing is discussed in Response L3-5. Also see Responses S6-1 through S6-15 and L3-6 through L3-18.
The comment provides a list of assertions, each of which are addressed in the following:

(1) Transportation, traffic, and parking impacts are fully addressed in Section 4.13 of the Draft EIR. As discussed in the Draft EIR, the traffic problems that are identified are not solely attributable to UCSD. In most cases, UCSD’s contribution to the impact is negligible. As further discussed in the Draft EIR, UCSD does not have the ability to mitigate these impacts because many of them are existing, were accepted by the City of San Diego through the adoption of the University Community Plan which indicated that traffic impacts would be significant and unavoidable, and are not within UCSD’s jurisdiction. Traffic impacts attributable to the proposed 2004 LRDP were identified in the Draft EIR as significant impacts and mitigated to the extent feasible. See also Response L3-5.

(2) Feasible mitigation measures for significant traffic impacts are provided in Section 4.13.3.1 of the Draft EIR. Most of the mitigation measures identified in this section address cumulative impacts, which are also identified in Section 4.13.3.1 and discussed briefly in Section 4.13.4. No further mitigation measures have been provided or identified.

(3) As identified in mitigation measure Tra-1C of the Draft EIR, UCSD would continue to implement its alternative transportation program, expanding upon it where appropriate. This program includes UCSD’s shuttle system.

(4) The comment does not identify which six intersections in Table 4.13-14 should be reevaluated or supply a reason or detail to support this statement, therefore further response is not possible. Refer to Response O21-2 regarding offsite traffic mitigation.

(5) The commentor’s suggestion will be considered by UCSD.

(6) The commentor’s suggestion will be considered by UCSD.

(7) UCSD is constantly pursuing funding to support its planned development and as discussed in the Draft EIR, UCSD has and will continue to do what is feasible in supporting transportation improvements in the community. Refer to Response L3-5 for further discussion regarding the feasibility of UCSD contributions to community traffic improvements.

Respectfully Submitted,

Stan Siegel
UCPG, Chair, Executive Committee

Linda Colley
UCPG, Vice Chair, Executive Committee
Chair, Sub-Committee, UCSD-EIR

Charles Herzfeld
UCPG, Executive Committee
Member Sub-Committee, UCSD-EIR

Michael G. Duffey
UCPG, General Member
Member Sub-Committee, UCSD-EIR
The descriptions for the 2004 LRDP land uses are appropriate given that it is a general planning level document that identifies the types of uses appropriate in a designated area. Refer to Response L2-1 for further discussion of the purpose of the LRDP.

As discussed in Response L2-1, it would be inappropriate to include project specific information in the proposed 2004 LRDP or Draft EIR, such as that requested by the commentor. However, when a specific project is proposed, it will be subject to project-level review under CEQA. Any development on the parcel would be related to UCSD programs or support activities. There are no plans to lease the land for commercial use.

The commentor’s suggestion will be considered by UCSD. Previous attempts by UCSD and the City of San Diego for cooperative long-term planning for Gliderport properties have not been successful, due in large part to City funding and staffing issues. Any future cooperative efforts would be welcomed by UCSD.

The commentor’s suggestion has been considered by UCSD, however, public use of the UCSD shuttle buses is not currently a feasible option primarily due to liability, capacity, and cost issues. In addition, the University was created to serve its students first and foremost; it is not a general service-providing public entity and does not have the same mission as general service state agencies. Many University services are only available to the University community of students, faculty and staff. The University apologizes that no formal response was received by the La Jolla Town Council to its resolution, however the suggestion was considered by the University.

As discussed in the proposed 2004 LRDP and Draft EIR, UCSD promotes the use of bicycles to travel through campus and provides lanes to separate bicycles from pedestrian traffic along the main north-south corridors on the western portion of the campus. UCSD endeavors to improve bicycle circulation on the campus and appreciates the commentor’s input. No comprehensive bike path with signalized rights of way and distinctive markings is currently proposed. However, the commentor’s suggestions and comments will be considered in future bicycle facilities planning.
O22-5 (cont.)

Refer to Response O22-5 regarding on-campus bicycle circulation. Bike routes in the surrounding community are specified in the University Community Plan and are not under the jurisdiction of UCSD. The City of San Diego’s plans for the La Jolla Village Drive Widening Project (CIP No. 52-452.0) provide for new bicycle lanes on La Jolla Village Drive (westbound) between Gilman Drive and Torrey Pines Road; and, on the ramp (eastbound) between Torrey Pines Road and Gilman Drive. These two bike lanes will provide a safe and formal connection between existing designated bicycle routes on Gilman Drive, Torrey Pines Road, and North Torrey Pines Road.

O22-6

This comment appears to be referring to Table 4.13-9, Intersection Analysis, in the Draft EIR. The Torrey Pines Road and La Jolla Village Drive intersection (Location #8) is included in that table on page 4.13-55 of the Draft EIR. In addition, this comment addresses potential future improvements to off-campus City of San Diego streets and intersections. UCSD does not have jurisdiction over off-campus streets nor does it propose improvements to them. The traffic safety situation at this intersection has been addressed on numerous occasions by the City of San Diego. In response to this comment, UCSD will request a City review of the intersection and pedestrian and bicyclist safety. The new bicycle lanes identified in Response O22-6 may be helpful in improving the existing situation. Also refer to Response O22-5.

O22-7

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Daniel T. Allen
NAME: Emmerson, Craig
DATE: July 8, 2004

LRDP EIR COMMENTS:
The areas of concerns relating to Sections 4.1 (Aesthetics), 4.9 (Noise), and 4.13 (Transportation, Traffic and Parking), that need to be addressed in the Long Range Development Plan/Environmental Impact Report (“EIR Report”) are (1) traffic safety and congestion, and (2) preservation of view corridors.

While further development of the SIO campus is both expected and desired by its administration, the EIR Report does not address traffic safety and congestion that will inevitably result from the already approved expansion and from future anticipated improvements. Nor does the EIR Report explain how SIO intends to preserve established view sheds and corridors that will necessarily be impeded by the expansion of facilities on campus. The EIR Report, at most, acknowledges that view sheds exist and may be impacted by anticipated improvements and that traffic will increase, additional parking will be needed and ingress and egress may change.

In particular, and for example, there is a 275 seat conference center that is slated for construction on the western-most portion of SIO, which is expected to draw more pedestrian and vehicular traffic to that area of the campus than the existing machine shop it replaces. There is no immediate plan to address the additional parking needs and traffic that will result. A multi-level parking structure is planned at some point in the future but the impact of that structure on the view shed and the traffic circulation has not been addressed. Assuming the view shed concerns are addressed, once the parking structure is completed it is anticipated that traffic will flow to and from La Jolla Shores Drive. However, until the parking facility is completed, which may be years away, El Paseo Grande will certainly be overburdened.

Before any additional approvals are granted for further development and construction, the actual impact of such development should be specifically identified. Finally, the manner of preserving view sheds and handling traffic issues should be expressly outlined so that SIO and the public may fully grasp the changes that are expected to occur and provide comments for consideration.

HOPKINS PARKING STRUCTURE COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.

SAN DIEGO SUPERCOMPUTER EXPANSION COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.

RADY SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT FACILITY COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.

O23-1 Traffic congestion is addressed in Draft EIR Section 4.13, Transportation, Traffic, and Parking. Increased vehicle trips resulting from development occurring under the proposed 2004 LRDP, including future development in SIO, has been included in the traffic analysis for the project and is therefore addressed in the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR addresses impacts to scenic vistas and visual character and quality in Section 4.1.3.1. This section identifies that a potentially significant aesthetic impact to public views from areas on and around the campus would occur and provides mitigation measure to reduce impacts. It is not clear what additional traffic safety and congestion issues the commentor believes need to be addressed in the Draft EIR. Traffic safety is generally ensured through traffic improvements, such as the placement of traffic signals, signs, and lane striping constructed in conformance with city and state standards. The City of San Diego would be responsible for any traffic improvements occurring off-campus, and UCSD would be responsible for improvements occurring on-campus.

O23-2 This comment refers to a project in the SIO area of campus that is already approved. The project is the Robert Paine Scripps Center (SCH No. 2003011010), was analyzed pursuant to CEQA, and was approved in the fall of 2003. The project is not addressed on a project-specific level in the Draft EIR because it is approved. See also Response L2-1.

O23-3 See Response O23-2. Prior to any approvals for future projects occurring under the 2004 LRDP, a project-specific environmental analysis would be required in accordance with CEQA, which would address any project-specific environmental impacts not covered in the LRDP EIR and would include public review as appropriate. The Draft EIR addresses impacts to viewsheds in Section 4.1.3.1 and transportation, traffic, and parking impacts in Section 4.13.
UCSD believes that the comment is addressing the scope of the traffic analysis, Section 4.13.3.1, of the Draft EIR. This section includes growth assumptions and trip generation for years 2000-01, 2005-06, 2010-11, and 2020-21. These assumptions not only include vehicle trips generated by the existing and future UCSD campus population (students, faculty, and staff), but also include trips generated by visitors to the campus. In addition, future years 2010-11 and 2020-21 include vehicle trips generated by the 17 present and probable future cumulative projects listed in Table 4-2 of the Draft EIR. This list of cumulative projects includes the UTC Shopping Center Expansion and La Jolla Commercial Center III and IV projects in the University Community. Therefore, the traffic analysis does take into account traffic impacts beyond those generated by the UCSD campus population alone.

With regard to the University retail strategy, UCSD does not intend to orient on-campus retail uses to the interests of the surrounding communities. They are to be campus serving, directed to the interests of the campus’s population of students, faculty, and staff. UCSD does not anticipate that its retail uses will generate additional trips beyond those of the students, faculty, staff, and visitors factored into the traffic analysis.
This is an introduction to the comment letter. Specific comments contained within the letter are responded to in the following responses. See also Response O18-1.

This comment discusses existing projects conducted by non-University parties occurring in residential areas outside of the jurisdiction of UCSD. The projects discussed are not part of the proposed project analyzed in the Draft EIR and thus are beyond the scope of the Draft EIR. In addition, these off-campus projects have not been endorsed or approved by UCSD. As discussed in Section 4.8.3.2 of the Draft EIR, the City of San Diego has jurisdiction over activities occurring on nearby non-University property, and has the authority to enforce penalties against activities occurring in these areas that do not conform to the City of San Diego Municipal Code.

Please see Attachment 2, Summary of Implementation of 1989 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures. As documented in the attachment, there are no mitigation measures that have not been implemented unless the anticipated impact never occurred (and therefore no accompanying mitigation was required), or the mitigation that was identified in the EIR was the responsibility of others to implement. The University’s planning efforts, as outlined in the 2004 LRDP, include the UCSD campus. UCSD does not conduct planning exercises for non-University property.

See response O25-2. UCSD does not have jurisdiction over off-campus property. In addition, the 2004 LRDP identifies 297 acres of undeveloped land, enough to accommodate the facilities needed for realizing the campus’ program goals. UCSD’s plans for future growth are within its current boundaries, as depicted on the proposed 2004 LRDP land use map (Figure 4.3-5 of the Draft EIR), with the exception of the potential for off-campus acquisition of apartment complex housing. As stated in the 2004 LRDP, the campus will continue to explore opportunities to acquire more off-campus, privately developed housing, just as it did when it purchased the La Jolla del Sol complex located approximately one mile from campus.
between Torrey Pines Road and Gilman Drive will REMAIN the boundary between university-oriented uses and the family-oriented residential area (SF zone), including La Jolla Highlands and La Jolla Shores Heights to the south. Further we ask that the 2004 LRDP EIR include a statement that UCSD will ACTIVELY OPPOSE UCSD-oriented institutional groups attempting to encroach into properties south of that boundary.

Further, we require assurances that unlike SDSU’s perimeter, gradually overtaken by student uses because of a lack of planning, EVERY EFFORT BE MADE NOW by UCSD, the City of San Diego, and/or La Jolla, should it gain citydom, to PREVENT UCSD-oriented institutional encroachment into the residential area south of the campus. One clear avenue of prevention would be to designate a potential future location for off-campus needs such as student-oriented religious institutions in a mixed-use zoned area of the University Community Plan designed to accommodate UCSD and its agglomerate uses. As you may be aware, some universities boast of using off-campus religious institutes to recruit students from certain populations. Recruitment devices and student-serving organizations should be accommodated in appropriate mixed-use locations.

Residential neighbors need assurances in the 2004 EIR that the single family zoned area WILL NOT be taken by eminent domain or as the sort of “redevelopment area” so dear to the hearts of certain architect(s), planning commissioner(s), and City Council members, and so destructive to prior established family-oriented neighborhoods.

La Jolla Village Drive is a FINE BOUNDARY. Let’s keep it that way. Why? Because a single family residence zone has different needs than a mixed use off-campus, student oriented neighborhood === for which provision has been made in the University Community Plan in the urban nodes EAST OF GILMAN DRIVE. UCSD has been slow off the block to facilitate the location of off-campus student-oriented institutions in that more appropriate mixed-use location.

*I would be remiss if I gave the impression that I don’t appreciate what UCSD offers this community. My entire family has taken classes at UCSD, attended plays, seminars, and recreational programs, so I have considerable respect for the efforts made by faculty, staff, and administration to keep this campus academically rigorous yet welcoming. I also walk on campus frequently, so I am familiar with the unique beauty the campus offers to pedestrians. As I walk, I marvel at the exquisite and particular sense of location I feel on Ridge Walk in the 1000 or so feet north of Eleanor Roosevelt dorms, when the ocean breeze catches my hair, where with one turn of my head I can see from the rim of the Pacific Ocean to the inland mountains and I know precisely where on this Earth I am. The physical plant for true education, education of the sort anticipated in the Revelle College core courses in literature and the continuity of human values, depends not only on the location of buildings, parking lots, and dorms, but on an awareness of the Spirit of Place.

It is the spirit of UCSD’s unique location atop a hill in a beach community, its promise as an integrator of intellect, understanding, and natural beauty as well as its intense impact on La Jolla that the 2004 UCSD LRDP EIR fails to grasp and neglects to grapple with. Because I am appreciate so deeply what this campus offers, I take seriously its plans and promises, past and future.
Thus, I am bound to question such new structures as the seemingly superfluous rooftop “channel” joining two sides of the Eleanor Roosevelt dorms and completely cutting off the ocean view from Ridge Walk, soon to be exacerbated by the skewed configuration of the Rady building planned to its north. So also must I question new plans for an immense multi-storied parking structure to be located beside low-frame dorms (soon to be deluged in traffic fumes and parking noise), and just south of open balconies of the Social Sciences building where faculty and students seek contemplative space for thought and conversation — will the noise level within 50 feet of the proposed Hopkins parking structure be the prescribed 50-55 dB you advocate in your Noise Appendix for contemplative space? That quiet section of campus is about as far as you can get from the “heavily traveled roads” where the 1989 EIR concluded such immense parking structures should be located. Something frightening has happened between the statement of human values in the 1989 LRDP and the discontinuity with those same values in the current LRDP EIR.

The mitigations promised in the 1989 plan have not come to pass. I include a letter from Planning apologizing for not making available the promised list of mitigations and unmet mitigations from the 1989 plan:

Attached is a table detailing the 53 mitigation measures identified for monitoring and reporting in the 1989 UCSD Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report. We acknowledge the absence, at present, of a comprehensive report detailing the implementation of these mitigation measures. We also acknowledge the need to complete such a report as soon as possible. I regret that we were not able to do this in the timely manner which I thought would be possible and that I had promised to you. Please contact me if you have any questions. MILT

Milton J. Phegley, AICP
Campus Community Planner
Government and Community Relations
University of California, San Diego
858-534-5782 (phone) 858-534-2998 (fax)
e-mail: mphegley@ucsd.edu

I received this email July 7, 2004, 2 days before the deadline for the EIR.

The lack of response of UCSD to community requests for public information resulted in the following letter from the La Jolla Community Planning Association requesting an extension of the public response period until the list is provided.

July 7, 2004

Arnold Schwarzenegger, President of the Board of Regents, Governor of California
Marsha A. Chandler, Acting Chancellor, UCSD
Mary Ann Fox, Chancellor Designate, UCSD
Robert Dynes, President, University of California
Board of Regents, University of California
University of California, San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA 92030-0893

RE: La Jolla Community Planning Association’s request for a comprehensive list of unmet mitigations remaining from the 1989 UCSD Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and immediate action to extend the
July 9, 2004 deadline for comments on the 2004 Environment Impact Review (EIR) for the UCSD LRDP until at least one month after such information is forthcoming in order to allow sufficient time for adequate review by the CPA Trustees and its Members.

ATTENTION: Acting Chancellor Chandler, Chancellor Designate Fox, President Dynes, and members of the Board of Regents of the University of California.

During the past year, the La Jolla Community Planning Association (CPA), numerous community groups and residents have repeatedly requested, and been promised, a list of unmet mitigations from UCSD's 1999 LRDP. That promise was reiterated, once again, by Mr. Phlegel, Government and Community Relations Representative for UCSD, at the June 14th UCSD LRDP Scoping Meeting on campus where Mr. Phlegel stated that the information would be made available before the end of June for community review. (Note attachment: Mr. Phlegel's email dated July 7, 2004.)

As the current deadline for Public Comment on the EIR for the new 2004 UCSD LRDP is July 9th, the CPA formally requests the following:

- Receipt of a comprehensive list of unmet mitigations from the 1999 UCSD LRDP prepared by UCSD and distributed for review to the CPA, community groups and residents.
- Extension of the deadline for comments on the EIR for the 2004 UCSD LRDP of at least one month following receipt of the list of unmet mitigations for the 1999 UCSD LRDP.
- Summary of UCSD meetings with City Representatives about off-campus mitigations held over the past fifteen years.

The UCSD "Revised Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report Mitigation Monitoring Plan" states: "The Campus Planning Office will be the focus for monitoring of mitigation measures called for in the LRDP EIR. A yearly report of monitoring status for all three types of mitigation measures will be made to the Vice Chancellor, Administration, with appropriate background information supplied by responsible campus units. These monitoring reports will be available to the public upon request.

The UCSD mitigation monitoring document further states that since CEQA requires lead agencies to develop procedures to ensure implementation of mitigation measures, specific monitoring procedures were implemented. It is significant to note that the document includes the following provision: "To encourage timely action (on infrastructure and off-campus mitigation) and to ensure the timely provision of University coordination, University representatives will meet at least once a year with City representatives to review progress and discuss results. The University will provide analytical data as needed to assist in the timely implementation of off-campus mitigation."

Thus, we respectfully request a comprehensive summary of mitigation monitoring results, including a list of 1999 LRDP unmet mitigations and adequate reports from meetings between UCSD and the City of San Diego about ongoing off-campus mitigation issues.

Residents of La Jolla are significantly impacted by the on-going expansion of the University. The blatant encroachment by institutions serving UCSD students, extending into open space parkland and residential property in a single family zone neighborhood adjacent to the campus, is the most recent egregious example. Ever increasing off campus student and staff parking poses safety issues, increased trash and inconvenience to the residents. UCSD must not only accept responsibility for the problems created in our neighborhoods and on our residential streets as a result of the swelling student population, but they must provide acceptable solutions.

The La Jolla Community Planning Association sincerely appreciates the efforts that UCSD is making to improve its relationship with our community. However, the effectiveness of UCSD to meet the mitigations of the prior plan has a direct bearing on the degree of likelihood that UCSD will effectively mitigate the proposed expansion in the 2004 LRDP. Thus, we need your further cooperation in providing data essential for diligent review by the surrounding community before the deadline for public review for the EIR.

We anticipate a prompt response to this request for information and an appropriate extension of the deadline for the public review period for the EIR.

Sincerely,

Simon Andrews, LJ CPA Chair
Mary Coolkey, LJ CPA Secretary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O25-10</strong> (cont.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (619) 840-0250  
coakleym@san.rr.com |
| • Please forward correspondence to:  
La Jolla Community Planning Association  
ATTN: Mary Coakley, Secretary  
P.O. Box 889  
La Jolla, CA 92037  
(619) 840-0250  
coakleym@san.rr.com |
| CC: Stan Siegel, UCSD Chair  
Mayor Dick Murphy, City of San Diego  
Councilmember Scott Peters, City of San Diego  
Steven W. Relyea, UCSD Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs  
Jeffrey A. Steinfort, UCSD Assistant Vice Chancellor Campus Planning  
James M. Langley, UCSD Vice Chancellor External Relations  
Mill Phlegley, UCSD Planning  
Catherine Freistyk, UCSD Planning |
| (This letter also included as a final page the email from Mr. Phlegley cited above it in this document.) |
| It my understanding that the La Jolla Town Council is also preparing a letter with a similar request for the list of unmet mitigations and for an extension of the deadline for public comment. |
| **O25-11** |
| At present no joint body exists where UCSD, the City of San Diego, and affected residents and businesses impacted by the campus can sit together and coordinate PLANNING for campus impacts. The 2004 LRDP EIR should make provision for such a joint and transparent planning body, so the community will be a victim and more a participant in plans for UCSD's future. |
| **O25-12** |
| The 2004 LRDP EIR executive summary notes p. 2-5 the desire of UCSD to comply with city zoning regulations. That would seem to mean honoring also the community plans of the adjacent communities. Some neighbors asking for greater transparency in UCSD-City mitigations of the impacts of UCSD on the surrounding neighborhoods have been accused by UCSD administrator(s) of trying to make a big, loud-mouthed, messy public ruckus of issues which the city, the university, its donors, and certain special interests would rather deal in the privacy of their own chambers. |
| Yet, it is simply transparent process that the residential community seeks. The current atmosphere of threat, of quiet subterfuge, of stealth planning, keeping the affected neighborhoods in the dark until the unplanned for is deposited on their doorsteps, is not acceptable. |
| **O25-13** |
| As I review the UCSD 1989 Revised LRDP EIR, even without the university's unprepared list of unmet mitigations, I note how few of the predicted impacts have been mitigated in the past 15 years. Unmet mitigations for student housing, traffic and transportation, noise levels, parking problems, pedestrian safety at certain campus entrances, and setbacks to keep campus buildings from looming over neighborhoods are among the more obvious from the point of view of nearby residents. While many of the unmet mitigations have severely impacted the surrounding neighborhood, it places an unfair burden on the community to have to ingest the entire 1989 plan, its EIR, and the immense 2004 UCSD LRDP EIR document to ferret out the effectiveness of UCSD's past promises of mitigation. The credibility of the 2004 EIR is seriously |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O25-11</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forums currently exist where UCSD, the City of San Diego, and other interested parties can provide, discuss, and give input on campus developments. In addition, UCSD will consider how to improve those forums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O25-12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As discussed in Section 4.8, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR, the proposed 2004 LRDP does not conflict with the community plans of the adjacent areas. Refer to Response O25-11. UCSD follows the California Bagley-Keene Act, which set standards for when meetings must be publicly noticed as well as open to the public. In addition, the 2004 LRDP EIR has followed the public notice and comment provisions of CEQA, which requires public review and comment on the Initial Study, Notice of Preparation, and Draft EIR. Although not required by CEQA, on June 14, 2004, UCSD held a publicly noticed meeting to take public comment on the Draft EIR. The Regents will consider the proposed 2004 LRDP at a publicly noticed meeting, expected to be held in September 2004. Thus, the University has provided an open public process as required by law in proposing and considering the 2004 LRDP and 2004 LRDP EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O25-13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 2004 LRDP EIR is not tiered from or related to the 1989 LRDP EIR. They are distinctly different documents based on two different Long Range Development Plans developed at different points in time. The 1989 LRDP and EIR will be superseded if The Regents certify the 2004 LRDP EIR and approve the 2004 LRDP. The 1989 LRDP is not being evaluated or considered in the current project and is thus beyond the scope of this EIR. Please refer to Attachment 2, summary of Implementation of 1989 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures. Also see Response O25-10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The issues that the commentor raises have not been ignored. Traffic and transportation issues on the surrounding roadway network are thoroughly addressed in Section 4.13, Transportation, Traffic, and Parking, of the Draft EIR. The locations where students, faculty, and staff reside are accounted for in the traffic analysis through the trip distribution described and illustrated in the Traffic Analysis Report (Appendix I of the Draft EIR). The dispersed locations of residences are also described and accounted for in the Population and Housing discussion, Section 4.10, of the Draft EIR. With regard to campus related uses in the surrounding community, the University Community Plan includes areas where development complementary to the UCSD can be established (refer to page 9 of the University Community Plan and to Response O25-5).

UCSD cannot speculate on the specific target markets of the new private developments within the City of San Diego. However, it is known that UCSD related populations represent a substantial portion of the potential housing market in the University Community. In addition, the La Jolla and University communities are not the only areas where UCSD related populations reside or are expected to reside (see Section 4.10 of the Draft EIR). No agreements have been developed between the City and UCSD regarding off-campus housing, however, as discussed on page 8 of the proposed 2004 LRDP, the City resolved to provide a land use plan to serve the University, which is evident in the University Community Plan.
The Executive Summary is merely a summary and is not intended to provide the detailed information requested by the commentor. The Draft EIR does describe and account for visitors to the campus. See Response O24-1. The traffic analysis provided in Section 4.13 of the Draft EIR includes UCSD visitor trips in its calculation of daily vehicle trips. Table 4.13-5 identifies the growth assumptions that were used to determine the trip generation for years 2005-06, 2010-11 and 2020-21, which includes increases in UCSD visitor trips. The total number of daily trips for each of the years analyzed is also provided in this table.

Limitations to campus size are considered in Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR. Three of the four alternatives (the No Project Alternative, the No Growth Alternative, and the Constrained Development Alternative) analyzed in detail under Section 6.3 of the Draft EIR contain specific limitations to campus size. Refer to Response O25-10 with regard to the 1989 mitigation measures.

The comment is referring to the growth inducement discussion of the 1989 LRDP EIR. This discussion indicated that implementation of the 1989 LRDP “may also result in the expansion of the infrastructure off campus.” This statement was a disclosure, not a commitment. However, since the adoption of the 1989 LRDP, expansion of off-campus infrastructure has occurred (i.e., transportation, water, sewer, and energy improvements). UCSD is not required to plan or monitor off-campus uses, therefore, the evidence that is requested by the commentor is unavailable.

There is no mandate for UCSD off-campus mitigations as alluded to by the commentor. The commentor’s question refers to areas that are outside of UCSD’s jurisdiction and control. Refer also to Response O25-5.

The areas referred to are outside of UCSD’s jurisdiction and control, and is not a part of the proposed project. It is the City of San Diego’s decision, not UCSD’s, to make this property available for development. Therefore, it is beyond the scope of this EIR.

As discussed in Response O7-1, UCSD will address these issues through a parking program and educational efforts. There are no significant impacts identified in the Draft EIR related to solid waste, therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

UCSD is supportive of the City of San Diego examining the merits of such parking restrictions, however, it is the City’s perogative to consider, approve, implement, and enforce these restrictions, not UCSD’s. Refer also to Response O5-1.
Recycled water use on campus is addressed in Section 4.14 of the 2004 LRDP EIR. Recycled water accounts for more than eight percent of total water consumption on campus, most of which is used for landscaping irrigation. UCSD cooperates with the City of San Diego by expanding upon the City's adjacent infrastructure to on campus areas, where feasible and appropriate. The City is responsible for developing recycled water distribution lines in the surrounding area. UCSD will continue to expand recycled water infrastructure on campus in this manner as feasible. Also, see Response L3-20.

Each of the ten campuses are evaluating planned growth increases to handle California's increased student population based on University of California studies. In evaluating future enrollment increases among the campuses in the University of California system, factors such as the need to grow on a systemwide basis, the physical ability of each campus to accommodate growth, feasible rates of growth and feasible proportions for growth relative to base enrollment at each campus, demographic issues, and other factors were considered. Chapter 6.0, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR addresses a variety of project alternatives, including Alternative Locations for Additional Campus Growth.

As discussed in the 1989 LRDP EIR, the growth inducement multiplier reference in the 1989 LRDP EIR was not validated. It is also now outdated. It is not considered valid for analysis of the proposed 2004 LRDP and was not used for the 2004 LRDP EIR.

The campus population estimates identified in the proposed 2004 LRDP reflect, in part, potential increases related to Health Sciences programs that are less student-oriented, and expanded faculty/researcher population estimates. The University is committed to maintaining excellence in teaching, research and public service.

UCSD believes that the area referenced in the comment is the Academic/Science Research Park land use, which comprises 30 acres (11.3 percent) of the east campus (over 266 acres). The east campus was dedicated to UCSD for "industrial scientific or technological research purposes." In addition to educational uses by a deed modification secured by UCSD in 1982. The Academic/Science Research Park is intended to accommodate private research entities that are compatible with university research programs and entail collaboration with UCSD faculty and students. UCSD facilities can also be located in this land use area.

Refer to Response O25-29. Also, no portion of the east campus is designated for semi-industrial use. The only mention of the word "industrial" on page 4.8-3 refers to the proposed Science Research Park, which is "intended to create an intellectual resource for the interaction among industrial and
It is not clear to this reader why additional business-industrial adjuncts to UCSD should not be located in the nearby Torrey Pines Science Park north and northeast of the campus, or in the developments southeast of 1-805. Increasing the total of students, staff, and faculty on campus to 49,700, not counting the tens of thousands of weekly campus visitors, servicing, deliveries, hospital patients, etc., without the infrastructure already in place to accommodate current needs, is not acceptable. Why not build undergraduate and graduate housing for current students in that east campus area, near the planned mass transit stops? After the mass transit system has been built, that is!

The 2004 Executive Summary downplays the highly significant proposed increase in faculty and staff and possible services necessary for 9000 new staff and faculty, many with families, possibly increasing the San Diego population by some 20,000 to 50,000 people. Hardly an insignificant impact. No mitigation or provision seems to be mentioned in this summary. While much of the staff increase seems to have an industrial orientation, if a business were bringing this many additional people to San Diego, would they be required to finance any of the infrastructure by contributing to a fund, like that in University City? What about UCSD’s responsibility?

Do you really think this area of San Diego needs a “growth inducement” of this magnitude, especially with no significant additional infrastructure in housing, public schools, libraries, community centers and public transportation? Yet the new plan seems to conclude that no mitigation is necessary. I am incredulous at the difference between impact data supplied by the 1989 EIR and the total lack of reference to it in the white-washing 2004 EIR.

Further, about student campus housing, previous reports state that currently only about one third of UCSD students are housed on campus (one-third of 23,000 = approx. 8,000). So approx. 16,000 students currently live off campus. If current student enrolment is 24,160 and the projected enrolment 29,900, pp. 2-2 and 2-4 of the 2004 LRDP EIR executive summary suggest that with implementation of Alternative 4: Increased campus housing, even if 100 percent of new student population was housed on campus, less than 45% of students would be housed on campus. So even providing housing for one hundred percent of new students would not alleviate the problems created by not meeting the best case in the 1989. In addition as many of the new students would be graduate students, which provide partners or families, the impact would be even greater on the off-campus facilities.

1989 Impact 3.2.3.2.2, Additional population. P. 3-52 states that additional population due to the UCSD 1989 LRDP is not considered a significant impact because it would increase use of public transportation systems. Possible light rail transit service, trolley, accessible commuter rail service, pedestrian access (from what local off-campus housing) are assumed – but as they have not materialized in the past 15 years of the prior LRDP and are unlikely in San Diego’s current financial climate – THERE IS A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT from any additional campus population growth. While the community appreciates the impacts and contributions of UCSD’s current educational and research capability, the natural limitations of this campus, unmitigatable as they are, simply do not permit such continued growth, no matter what justifications the promises of an EIR might make. Remember, this is the same university that currently cannot even provide a list of the unmet mitigations from its prior plan!

1989 Impact 3.1.3.4 Accommodation

academic research activities, enhance retention of outstanding researchers, and enhance private support for UCSD’s graduate and undergraduate fellowships, training, research, and collaboration” (emphasis added). The use of the word “industrial” is to indicate one of the types of research that would be conducted in that area. The impacts of campus growth including development of the Science Research Park portion of the campus are included in the Draft EIR. Transportation, traffic, and parking are addressed in Section 4.13 of the Draft EIR. Schools are addressed in Section 4.11. Childcare facilities are detailed in the Draft EIR (see Response L2-1).

Refer to Responses O25-29 and O25-30. With regard to building housing on the east campus, it is UCSD’s plan to expand housing on the east campus. As indicated in the proposed 2004 LRDP Land Use Plan, Draft EIR Figure 3.4-5, a sizeable portion of the east campus is designated for housing. See Response O25-31 regarding the phasing of campus development with transportation improvements.

The Executive Summary of the Draft EIR is merely a summary of the information contained in the remainder of the document, therefore, more detailed discussions are provided elsewhere. However, the Executive Summary does include Table 2-1, which is a summary table of environmental impacts (including those that would occur from expansion of the campus population) and mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR. Refer to Response O25-32 regarding contributions to an FBA or similar fund.

As discussed in Section 4.10, Population and Housing, of the Draft EIR, San Diego and the rest of California are already growing. It is because of this growth and the campus goal of expanding its academic programs that there is demand for UCSD to grow. The term “growth inducement” is a CEQA term of art under which an EIR analyzes whether a project may cause additional growth in a geographical area. The need for additional infrastructure, where applicable, is identified in the appropriate sections of the Draft EIR. Where significant environmental impacts could occur, the Draft EIR recommends all identified feasible mitigation measures. The commentor does not provide specific mitigation measure recommendations. With regard to the difference between the 1989 LRDP EIR and the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR, refer to Response O25-33.

Refer to Response T1-8. Section 6.3.4.1 of the Draft EIR discusses the environmental impacts associated with Alternative 4, the Increased Campus Housing Alternative. This section indicates that this alternative could result in increased impacts to neighboring land uses to the point that some could be significant and unavoidable.
The commentor, in discussing matters from the 1989 LRDP EIR, which is not part of the proposed 2004 LRDP EIR, thus raises issues that are beyond the scope of this EIR. However, the comment incorrectly presents the information from the 1989 LRDP EIR. The 1989 LRDP EIR discloses that the additional population from the 1989 LRDP would increase use of public transportation systems. It concludes that this increase is not considered a significant impact. The 1989 LRDP EIR also discloses possible public transportation projects but they are not “assumed.” The commentor’s assertion that there is a significant impact from any additional campus population growth is unsubstantiated in the comment. The magnitude of growth planned for under the 2004 LRDP, however, does result in several significant impacts that are identified in the Draft EIR. Refer to Response O18-1 regarding the 1989 mitigation measures.

This comment refers to statements made in the 1989 LRDP EIR, not in the proposed 2004 LRDP. Thus, this comment is beyond the scope of this EIR.

As discussed in the proposed 2004 LRDP additional on-campus housing units are planned. The programs that the commentor references that are in the 1989 LRDP do not relate to the development of housing and are not contained in the 2004 LRDP. However, UCSD has explored the feasibility of entering into agreements with third parties to provide student housing and will continue to look for similar opportunities. Providing a greater percentage of housing is considered and addressed in Section 6.3.4 of the Draft EIR in the Increased Campus Housing Alternative.

This comment refers to Site 653, which is within the City of San Diego’s, not UCSD’s jurisdiction. Refer to Response O25-2 and O25-5.

The Potiker theatre and the Eleanor Roosevelt buildings are existing projects addressed in separate CEQA documents and thus are beyond the scope of this EIR. It is not clear what the commentor is questioning in the Draft EIR’s Tables 2-1 and 2-2. Table 2-1 provides a summary of environmental impacts and mitigation measures identified in the 2004 LRDP EIR, including the issue of aesthetics. Table 2-2 provides a summary of cumulative impacts and mitigation measures identified in the 2004 LRDP EIR, including the issue of aesthetics. Aesthetics are discussed in greater detail in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIR. This section indicates that significant aesthetic impacts could occur from development under the 2004 LRDP and specifies mitigation measures to reduce impacts below a level of significance. Included in these mitigation measures are Aes-1A and 1B that include the possibility of using setbacks to reduce impacts. As for other documents that promote pedestrian circulation and ambience, the Draft EIR and proposed 2004 LRDP both discuss these concepts. They are also evident in several of UCSD’s planning reports, studies, and other documents.
 COMMENTS

O25-40 Water supply is addressed in Section 4.14, Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy, of the Draft EIR. Significant impacts to water supply were not identified in the Draft EIR and therefore no mitigation is required. However, the use of desalination for the region’s water supply is discussed in the Water Supply Assessment, Appendix J of the Draft EIR. Refer to Response O25-25 regarding use of recycled water.

O25-41 Noise impacts and mitigation measures are addressed in Section 4.9 of the Draft EIR. The 1989 LRDP EIR and the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR are distinctly different documents based on two different LRDPs developed at different points in time. Furthermore, the Draft EIR includes mitigation measures for noise impacts and these measures are generally more detailed and restrictive than those in the 1989 LRDP EIR.

O25-42 Section 4.13.3.2 of the Draft EIR addresses off-campus parking capacity, including UCSD related parking on off-campus streets. The commentor’s assertion regarding impacts to safety and usability are not supported in the comment. See also Response O5-1.

RESPONSES

O25-40 Water supply is addressed in Section 4.14, Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy, of the Draft EIR. Significant impacts to water supply were not identified in the Draft EIR and therefore no mitigation is required. However, the use of desalination for the region’s water supply is discussed in the Water Supply Assessment, Appendix J of the Draft EIR. Refer to Response O25-25 regarding use of recycled water.

O25-41 Noise impacts and mitigation measures are addressed in Section 4.9 of the Draft EIR. The 1989 LRDP EIR and the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR are distinctly different documents based on two different LRDPs developed at different points in time. Furthermore, the Draft EIR includes mitigation measures for noise impacts and these measures are generally more detailed and restrictive than those in the 1989 LRDP EIR.

O25-42 Section 4.13.3.2 of the Draft EIR addresses off-campus parking capacity, including UCSD related parking on off-campus streets. The commentor’s assertion regarding impacts to safety and usability are not supported in the comment. See also Response O5-1.

As I look at tables from the 1989 UCSD mitigation document provided by Mr. Phlegley as an attachment to his letter included above, I am struck by the sensibleness of the 1989 EIR — and by the apparent bypassing of its wisdom in the past 15 years since, and in the 2004 plan:

- The university will incorporate where feasible the following site design measures to reduce long-term noise on campus:
  - Multi-story student residences located within an ultimate unobstructed 60 dBA CNEL contour may require architectural treatments above the first story and will be addressed in the detailed acoustical assessment.
  - Dormitory structures will be oriented away from adjacent roadways where feasible and incorporate room arrangements, window size and placement, and balconies, roof and courtyard design which minimizes intrusive noise levels to the extent possible.
  - Noise sensitive courtyard or recreational open space areas will be shielded from intrusive noise levels by intervening structures to the extent possible.
  - Parking lots and structures will be located adjacent to noise sources such as heavily traveled roadways to make more efficient use of building setbacks and shield more sensitive residential and educational uses where feasible.

If on-campus residences need a little quiet, so do neighborhoods. Homes with open windows, (‘courtyards’ in home parlance are our front and back yards) need some peace and quiet. We consider the ability to spend some time outside a “natural resource” of this community.

Traffic and Transportation and Noise Mitigation

Currently, much of the transit planning in this city doesn’t even include La Jolla! The touted off-campus shuttle in the UTC area, while reportedly carrying 14,000 students a week, breaks down to just over a thousand individuals using it on a daily basis — and many of those are simply driving their cars to neighborhood streets, community center parking lots, and business center parking lots, parking their cars in spots the local community needs, and hopping on the shuttle so
### COMMENTS

**O25-43** (cont.)

that they can park free off-campus AND not have to walk! Drive around the half mile perimeter of UCSD campus from 5 a.m., before the parking starts, checking streets and parking lots, and then again about 9:30 a.m. and see the difference. That difference is primarily caused by UCSD. It severely impacts the safety and usability of neighborhoods and business centers.

**O25-44**

The 1989 LRDP EIR notes in section 3.2.2.1 (a) on p. 3-52 the following mitigations relevant to the nearby residents south of the campus:

```
(h) Provide special treatment, consisting of additional turn lanes and possibly tunneling at La Jolla Village Drive/Torrey Pines Road intersection.
```

**O25-45**

```
(k) provide missing ramps at the Interstate 5/Ardath Road (now La Jolla Parkway) intersection.
```

The missing I-5 ramps noted in (k) are a great idea – and would certainly be a first step toward mitigating the growing noise and traffic problems in this neighborhood.

**O25-46**

While some traffic redirection has recently been done in conjunction with the widening of La Jolla Village Drive in that area, the improvements, alas, with the double turn lane south from Torrey Pines Road onto La Jolla Village Drive, have simply made the road more dangerous for pedestrians to cross and raised the irritation level of drivers significantly, such that lines of cars honking horns now increase the noise level both at the intersection and within the neighborhood. Many neighbors including myself have almost been hit, and are forced to yell at drivers who ignore the new red turn arrow, or to bash on cars about to hit them, as drivers blindly turn the corner, looking in the other direction for oncoming traffic while the cell phone pressed to their right ear blinds them to pedestrians stepping into the crosswalk on La Jolla Village Drive at Torrey Pines Road. Oh yes, let’s double the traffic with no public transit mitigation on this side of campus! What are you thinking? ARE you?

**O25-47**

The tunneling proposed in (h) above, to carry traffic to and from La Jolla that should be routed directly to and from I-5 along La Jolla Parkway in as mitigation (k), would not be my first choice. Yet I know that University City is considering grade separation for certain traffic problems there.

**O25-48**

The construction of a ramp from La Jolla Parkway-Highway 52 to I-5 North would considerably decrease the congestion at La Jolla Village Drive and Torrey Pines Road as currently all northbound traffic from La Jolla to I-5 funnels between UCSD and the residential neighborhood. Unlike commercial structures, most homes in this temperate area do not have air conditioning so it is not possible to filter the pollutants from this much traffic so close to residents. Most of us live with windows open to the natural breezes. Excess noise is an additional form of pollution in an otherwise quiet neighborhood like ours. Unmitigated, anticipated 75-76 Db traffic noise from overly trafficked nearby roads, excess noise from students and theater goers parking within the small neighborhood streets, car alarms, car door beepers late into the night are a far cry from the mockingbirds, night herons, and owls who frequent this neighborhood. Remember, some of your own Nobel Prize winners, administrators, professors, staff, and their families live in homes in this neighborhood, so even if you’d rather not, you should care about their health and safety!

### RESPONSES

**O25-44**

This comment refers to planned traffic improvements in the 1987 University Community Plan discussed in the 1989 LRDP EIR. Refer to Response O25-13 regarding applicability of the 1989 LRDP EIR.

**O25-45**

The widening of the La Jolla Village Drive is a City of San Diego project that is not proposed as part of the 2004 LRDP. UCSD does not have jurisdiction over this intersection. In addition, as shown in Tables 4.13-7 and 4.13-9 of the Draft EIR, implementation of the 2004 LRDP would have minimal influence on this intersection and adjacent roadway segments. Furthermore, it would not be responsible for doubling traffic. Even with cumulative projects, Table 4.13-7 of the Draft EIR indicates that the roadway segments would not double in volume. Significant impacts at this intersection were not identified, therefore, no mitigation is required.

**O25-46**

Refer to Response O25-44.

**O25-47**

Refer to Responses O25-44 and O25-45. Air and noise impacts are addressed in Sections 4.2 and 4.9 of the Draft EIR, respectively.

**O25-48**

Refer to Responses O25-44 and O25-45.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O25-48</strong>&lt;br&gt;(cont.) Drive and Torrey Pines Road? Not only is the intersection already a horror for pedestrians crossing there but neighborhood residents such as myself have had to build expensive walls both to deflect the growing noise, pollution, and driver craziness at that intersection and to reduce the constant headlight &quot;burn&quot; flashing through the windows of our homes at night.</td>
<td><strong>O25-49</strong> Refer to Responses O25-21 and O25-22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O25-49</strong> Would it not make more sense to leave the paper street abutting Site 653 on the south side of La Jolla Village Drive intact and use it for mitigations already needed, like a buffer, like sound-protecting, sound-protected community open space, as the university continues its looming, pedestrian unfriendly growth along the north face of La Jolla Village Drive?</td>
<td><strong>O25-50</strong> The 1989 LRDP EIR lists the expansion of public transit as a measure that could be undertaken by other agencies to improve traffic conditions in the area. However, no level of expansion was assumed and the EIR concludes that cumulative traffic impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Refer also to Responses L2-1 through L2-4 regarding light rail transit and O25-13 regarding the applicability of the 1989 LRDP EIR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O25-50</strong> Mr. Ron Roberts, now a mayoral candidate for San Diego, commented in 1989 on UCSD’s need to incorporate mass transit, including the trolley, which the 1989 LRDP used over and over as a mitigation for growth – yet the trolley he advocated back then, and which was used by UCSD to justify its 1989 LRDP, 15 years later, does not exist, nor is it yet anywhere in sight. It’s comforting to know that San Diego and the state of California are in such good financial shape (not) that providing mass transit to and from the ever increasing distances UCSD users not housed on or near campus must travel daily is just another walk in the park for this city (oh, but considering the fate of Designated open space park Site 653, what park?!).</td>
<td><strong>O25-51</strong> This comment is incorrect. UCSD staff did not indicate that alternative public transportation is funded solely by traffic and parking violations nor is it a true statement. Revenues from citations issued by the campus are allocated to support alternative transportation programs; however, those programs are primarily funded from other transportation and parking funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O25-51</strong> According to a recent presentation by UCSD planning staff, any alternate public transportation is to be funded solely from citations for violations of current traffic and parking regulations. Such a flaky funding organization, when parking problems in surrounding communities already abound, strikes affected residential and business communities as disingenuous, and hardly a sincere effort to solve even the current, not to mention the long-term transportation issues generated jointly by UCSD and UTC (planned?) developments. This university needs a system for the long haul, a system this city can count on.</td>
<td><strong>O25-52</strong> Refer to Response L3-5 regarding the phasing of campus development with transportation improvements. In addition, no campus expansion is analyzed in the Draft EIR, Section 6.3.2, as the No Campus Growth Alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O25-52</strong> What if no campus expansion was allowed until UCSD and the City of San Diego worked out and installed a viable public transportation plan for this entire area? Too little too late could be prevented by a lot more a little sooner!</td>
<td><strong>O25-53</strong> As discussed in Section 4.13.1.6, a new parking policy, which would restrict the first-year resident students from bringing cars to campus, is being considered by UCSD. Furthermore, the Draft EIR includes mitigation measure Tra-1C to reduce traffic impacts and specifies a number of other measures required to reduce impacts, many of which are planned in an FBA or a community plan. Refer to Response L3-5 regarding the phasing of campus development with transportation improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O25-53</strong> It seems that in the 2004 EIR, most of the planned student accommodation is directed to the west campus, where apparently little or no improvement or mitigation of traffic problems is planned. Why then does not UCSD join other universities in prohibiting undergraduates in student housing from bringing cars to campus. Has this option been studied? If the on-campus shuttle service from the west side of campus is going to connect so effectively with the planned mass transit toward the middle and east of campus, then it should all work just fine. It simply needs to be there before all the students arrive!</td>
<td><strong>O25-54</strong> UCSD does not have jurisdiction over the La Jolla Village Drive and Torrey Pines Drive intersection. In addition, as shown in Tables 4.13-7 and 4.13-9 of the Draft EIR, implementation of the 2004 LRDP would have minimal influence on this intersection and adjacent roadway segments. Furthermore, even with cumulative projects, significant impacts at this intersection do not occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O25-54</strong> According to my calculations from data in the 2004 UCSD LRDP EIR traffic tables, more than 5,000 vehicles PER HOUR (in peak times), including drive throughs and turners, are slated to traverse the pedestrian crosswalk at La Jolla Village Drive and Torrey Pines, a stone’s throw from my home. Some might say, well, what would you expect living near a university of this size? In response, my neighbors, some of whom are original owners in this stable, ‘50’s development, would reply – this residential neighborhood pre-existed the university. Why should the neighbors bear the brunt of an unmitigated LACK OF PLANNING AND CONSIDERATION about the pre-existing community’s needs, by both the city and the university for traffic in this area?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would bring to your attention that the Traffic Noise Level Table 6 and 7 in Appendix G of the Noise Report of the 2004 LRDP appears to omit the important traffic segment on La Jolla Village Drive from Torrey Pines Road to La Jolla Scenic North, the part of La Jolla Village Drive that has NO mitigations, no walls, nothing to protect the residential community from the sounds, dangers, and confusion of that traffic segment.

Is there some reason for omission of that intersection from the noise tables, one of the most significant for both vehicles and pedestrian entering the south from? In the volumes of information necessary for review, I may have missed it. But if not, it should have been included.

2004 LRDP EIR Appendix G discusses exterior noise environment. Section 4.2.1, p. 19 of that appendix states that “implementation of the LRDP would result in increased vehicular traffic on the regional road network, which would incrementally increase ambient noise levels.” Section 4.2.2, mitigation measures states that exterior sound levels are to be less than 65dBA to ensure that outdoor sensitive land uses are not subjected to inappropriate noise levels resulting from roadways. While the essential information about the area by Site 653 is missing from Tables 6 and 7, this mitigation issue is a joint on-campus off-campus issue. Mitigation for traffic noise abutting our residential area is necessary now, before there is any increase in UCSD population, with or without the proposed intensification of use on Site 653, or any additional ADT’s at the south end of campus on La Jolla Village Drive, Torrey Pines Road, or North Torrey Pines Road northeast of the intersection.

A recent noise study by Hiller of San Diego, for its proposed encroachment onto public open space, measured the current level of noise on Site 653 near corner as 73dBA, a significant increase from the 60 dBA and 65 dBA considered neighborly in the 1989 plan. Is there not a more appropriate mixed-use zoned location for a multi-use building for a growth-oriented group with a self-stated mission “to prove a renaissance of Jewish life.” To quote the Hiller pamphlet containing postcards delivered to the Mayor of San Diego, “Hiller of San Diego sponsors an ever-expanding agenda of programs, including religious studies and observances, cultural events, cultural events, Israel-related programs and social action activities for students, both undergraduate and graduate, as well as faculty members on the UCSD campus.” All that on our open space parkland, while intensifying the traffic, noise, and pollution on the narrow streets of the residential neighborhood, increasing the danger to children from increased traffic, exacerbating parking problems, increasing waste management issues, ignoring lack of infrastructure, and increasing the significant overall irritation with university overflow into the residential neighborhood? Hiller plans to offer that 73dBA space, a few feet from the congestion, pollution, and danger of that intersection as compensation for the 60-65 dBA open space part of Site 653 further east. Such generosity! Perhaps a park in the turning lane would be a good idea too! You may discern that I am angry about a private religious institution taking over public park land for special interest uses in a single family residential area where few students live. I would also ask UCSD, is it prudent, considering the safety of its own students, for UCSD not to oppose the Hiller student center on the south bank of that intersection within the residential neighborhood? Again, when the Chancellor Designate states that she wants to blur the boundaries, what exactly is this neighborhood to anticipate?

Unfortunately the new UCSD LRDP does not provide for student off-campus needs in a way that would prevent further encroaches into this residential neighborhood. In addition its plans include a significant increase in traffic on the west side of campus with little attention to public

The comment correctly identifies that Tables 6 and 7 of the Noise Technical Report provided as Appendix G to the Draft EIR do not include the roadway segment of La Jolla Village Drive from Torrey Pines Road to La Jolla Scenic Drive. The noise calculations for this segment indicate that there would not be a significant impact on this segment (see table below), however, Table 4.9-5 of the Draft EIR has been revised to include this information. This does not change the relevant analysis or significance conclusions.

Table 1. Future Traffic Noise Levels on La Jolla Village Drive between Torrey Pines Road to La Jolla Scenic Drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>ADT</th>
<th>Percent Medium Trucks</th>
<th>Percent Heavy Trucks</th>
<th>Speed Limit (mph)</th>
<th>CNEI at 50 ft from centerline (dBA)</th>
<th>Approximate Distance (ft) to CNER Noise Contour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>38,700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>875, 125, 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 with LRDP</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>770, 280, 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 with LRDP</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>875, 275, 90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WRB

As discussed in Response O25-55, the noise data pertaining to this segment have been added to the EIR. These data do not indicate significant impacts related to implementation of the 2004 LRDP for this segment. The commentor is requesting mitigation for an existing condition. The 2004 LRDP and Draft EIR are not the appropriate documents/mechanisms to deal with existing impacts, but rather the Draft EIR proposes feasible mitigation for significant impacts that could occur as a result of the project. Mitigation is not required under the Draft EIR for additional UCSD related traffic on this road segment because a significant impact associated with the 2004 LRDP do not occur as a result of the project.


The commentor’s reference to student off-campus encroachments are responded to in various previous responses, notably in Responses O25-5 and O-25-14. Traffic impacts are addressed in Section 4.13 of the Draft EIR which include identification of feasible mitigation measures for significant impacts. This section of the Draft EIR also addresses cumulative impacts from the anticipated development of the surrounding area.
Parking is addressed in Section 4.13 of the Draft EIR. Refer also to Response O5-1.

Section 4.9, Noise, of the Draft EIR identifies significant noise impact and specifies mitigation measures for those impacts. If mitigation measures are not provided, it is because no significant impact was identified. The Draft EIR does not conclude that noise impact would be unavoidable. All significant noise impact identified in the Draft EIR can be mitigated to below a level of significance.

Refer to Response O25-13 regarding the applicability of the 1989 LRDP EIR. The noise standards that are employed in the Draft EIR are based on current applicable standards. Response O1-5 discusses expansion of parking on the east campus. With regard to the commenter’s suggestion of expanding parking on the east campus, it is possible that an alternative of expanding parking only on the east campus would avoid or reduce some traffic impacts to those streets and intersections on the west side of the campus. However, it is also likely that such an alternative would increase impacts to the streets and intersection on the east side of the campus.
The 1989 EIR, p. 3-58 discusses the creation of Ridge Walk, one of the few public places on campus where a person senses the majesty of UCSD’s location, on the ridge between the mountains on the east and the Pacific on the west – yet in the new LRDP, construction of the new Rady School of Management will devastate most of the available view corridor where pedestrians can clearly enjoy the unique position of the campus. The unnecessarily j-shaped Rady building plan, combined with the grossly view-blocking “bridge” structure atop the new Eleanor Roosevelt dorm, adjacent to Ridge Walk will all but obliterate the ocean view for most of Ridge Walk, so what was a refreshing, breeze-touched vista for pedestrians will become an uninviting “tunnel” between buildings. Is there some way to meet campus growth needs without destroying its uniqueness? It would be sad if in a few years such a beautiful campus were graded an “F” for Natural Aesthetics.

Pedestrian mitigation is currently needed also at the intersection of La Jolla Village Drive and Torrey Pines Road. Dependence on police ticketing to protect citizens driving and walking in that area is simply insufficient.

Emergency response and Evacuation Plans: With the proposed increase in campus population, in the case of an earthquake or other severe problem, many more than the current numbers of campus users would be affected. What provision has been made for current populations and expanded populations to exit the campus? What provision has been made on site for those who live on campus in the event of a catastrophic emergency? During the summer, the traffic congestion following the July 4 events in La Jolla gives some intimation of the vulnerability of this area to large migrations. A recent newspaper article shows that in addition to UCSD’s impact in this area, more than 800,000 people use La Jolla Shores Beach annually – how much traffic can the interior roads of this community accommodate, with and without emergencies?

UCSD needs to mitigate current problems caused in part by the expansion from the 1989 UCSD LRDP, before plunging ahead with an even more intense-use LRDP for the next 20 years.

Respectfully submitted,

Penelope Brunk
8975 Cliffridge Ave.
La Jolla CA 92037
858-623-9323

Views from the Ridge Walk are discussed in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR. It is because of these views that the Ridge Walk and surrounding area are designated as a Visual Sensitive Zone (Zone B). The mitigation measures specified in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIR would reduce impacts to views from the Ridge Walk to below a level of significance. With regard to the proposed Rady School of Management, as discussed in Section 4.1 of the project specific analysis for this project (in Volume III of the Draft EIR), the project has been sited to preserve views of the ocean from the Ridge Walk. Refer to Response TI-13 for more detail.

The commentor is referring to an existing condition at a location off-campus and outside of the University’s jurisdiction. Refer also to Responses O25-45, O25-54, and O25-56.

Potential impacts associated with seismic events are discussed in Section 4.5 of the Draft EIR. As discussed in that section, all construction under the 2004 LRDP will comply with the California Building Code as well as the UC Seismic Safety Policy. The topic of emergency response and evacuation plans is addressed in Draft EIR Section 4.6.3.6. As discussed in this section, UCSD has an Emergency Management Plan which addresses planned responses, instructions, and procedures to various levels of manmade or natural emergency situations for all campus staff, students, and visitors.

Please refer to Response O25-10.
The statement is based upon a letter received from the Native American Heritage Commission dated December 23, 2003 (included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR) that states: “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.” The letter goes on to say that the absence of specific information does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in the project area, and suggests that representatives of area bands should be contacted for additional information. The fact that future information could come to light regarding Native American concerns for UCSD resources is why the statement contains the phrase “at this time.”

The comment discusses past projects that are not part of the proposed project and thus are beyond the scope of the Draft EIR. However, with regard to the Scripps Estates and Coast Apartments sites, UCSD understands that those past excavations and subsequent actions would not be considered appropriate in light of current sensitivity to Native American cultural patterns and with respect to both federal and state law (most notably, the state Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act). The commenter is reminded, however, that these excavations took place in 1958 through the early 1960’s, substantially before the cited Act was in place. In addition, please note that the site discussion also clearly stated that a subsequently (more recently) located burial was addressed via halting construction excavation, conducting Native American consultation, and reburial of the remains in accordance with the Native American guidance provided. With regard to the University House site, the primary notations regarding burials eroding from the cliffs along the ocean were made in 1929. UCSD’s collections of cultural items serve as valuable educational and research tools and provide invaluable insights into the past. UCSD maintains these collections as a public trust and takes seriously its responsibility to preserve these resources. Any and all cultural items will be processed in full compliance with all provisions of NAGPRA. See Response O15-1.
It is unclear how the DEIR reached the above conclusion. It does not appear that UCSD performed a site search with the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to locate places of known native cultural value. Moreover, the DEIR does not state whether UCSD engaged in any consultation with interested tribal communities in drafting its LRDP or the DEIR. Since we understand UCSD accepts federal funding for at least some of its campus programs and development, UCSD should have engaged in consultation, notably with federally recognized tribes historically and culturally affiliated with this area. Was the State Office of Historic Preservation contacted? Has UCSD contacted the NAHC and engaged in notification and consultation with respect to its LRDP and DEIR?

If UCSD had contacted the NAHC, entered into consultations with the local Native communities and checked with knowledgeable local and state anthropologists, we are quite certain that the conclusion stated above would not have been made in the DEIR. We have provided those sections of the DEIR related to archaeology to Ms. Lucas at her request. She reserves the right to send additional comments once she has examined the DEIR in greater detail. We do observe that the mitigation measures do NOT propose the requirement of a Native American monitor and do NOT include Native cultural values (with the possible exception of burials) in significance determinations. We request that the mitigation program and significance determinations be revised to add these requirements.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments. Please indicate how these issues will be addressed in the FEIR, LRDP and the mitigation and monitoring plan for this and future UCSD projects. We look forward to reviewing the responses to our comments and receiving a copy of the FEIR.

Very truly yours,

Courtney Ann-Coyle
Attorney at Law

Cc: Sec. Larry Myers, Native American Heritage Commission
Hon. Steve Banegas, Spokesman, Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee
Client file

Refer to Response O26-1. UCSD contact with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) is documented in the Draft EIR in Appendix A--Initial Study, Notices of Preparation and Scoping. With regard to contact with the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), the State Clearinghouse forwarded copies of the Draft EIR both to the OHP and NAHC, neither of which has provided comment letters. Documentation of this is provided in the Final EIR.

Refer to Response O26-1 through O26-3 regarding NAHC coordination. Also, this response reiterates that the intent was not to diminish the importance of campus resources, or the ties that Native Americans may have to them—it was merely a factual statement, that at this time, none of the sites were identified on the NAHC site list.

UCSD disagrees that the only location in which Native American input is identified as of import in project mitigation measures and determination of significance is with regard to burials. First, Cul-2E notes that prior to required monitoring activities, the pre-construction meeting shall include the archaeologist, construction contractor, and/or grading contractor (participants that would be required for all monitoring jobs), as well as other appropriate personnel. This terminology was designed to allow the measure to fit all required situations, and provide the widest possible leeway. Depending on the specific locale, it might include an historian, an architect, or a Native American monitor. The additional personnel specific to the job would depend on the site in question. In addition, later in this section in the discussion of Discoveries and Determination of Significance, the Draft EIR text states: “The significance of the discovered resources shall be determined by the [Principal Investigator] in consultation with…and the Native American Community, if applicable.” There is no intent to eliminate the valuable voice of the Native American community out of the process leading to better understanding and appreciation of University cultural resources.

Refer to Response O26-1 through O26-3 regarding NAHC coordination. Also, this response reiterates that the intent was not to diminish the importance of campus resources, or the ties that Native Americans may have to them—it was merely a factual statement, that at this time, none of the sites were identified on the NAHC site list.

UCSD disagrees that the only location in which Native American input is identified as of import in project mitigation measures and determination of significance is with regard to burials. First, Cul-2E notes that prior to required monitoring activities, the pre-construction meeting shall include the archaeologist, construction contractor, and/or grading contractor (participants that would be required for all monitoring jobs), as well as other appropriate personnel. This terminology was designed to allow the measure to fit all required situations, and provide the widest possible leeway. Depending on the specific locale, it might include an historian, an architect, or a Native American monitor. The additional personnel specific to the job would depend on the site in question. In addition, later in this section in the discussion of Discoveries and Determination of Significance, the Draft EIR text states: “The significance of the discovered resources shall be determined by the [Principal Investigator] in consultation with…and the Native American Community, if applicable.” There is no intent to eliminate the valuable voice of the Native American community out of the process leading to better understanding and appreciation of University cultural resources.
Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, the cited NOP comment letters were considered by UCSD in identifying the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant effects analyzed in the EIR and eliminating issues found less than significant from detailed study. The comment letters were also included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR, and will be included in the Final EIR. Although, CEQA does not require responses to NOP comment letters and the following responses are for comments on the Draft EIR only, the campus did consider the NOP letter when drafting the EIR.

UCSD held public scoping meetings for the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR on August 27, 2003 and December 18, 2003. All members of the public, including UCSD residential and institutional neighbors and public figures, were welcome to attend these meetings and provide input regarding the scope of issues addressed in the EIR. In addition, UCSD staff have made presentations to community groups of the surrounding neighborhoods, including some homeowners associations. These presentations provided summaries of the University’s planning process and the proposed 2004 LRDP, and notified attendants of the opportunities for public input in the planning and EIR preparation process. Similar information has also been provided to Councilmember Scott Peters. Chapter 7 of the Draft EIR identifies individuals directly involved with the preparation of the Draft EIR and persons consulted in preparing the Draft EIR. Every effort has been made to incorporate relevant issues raised by the public into the proposed 2004 LRDP and Draft EIR, including those made by the commentor.
2. Impacts to Recreational Parks Incomplete. Chapter 4 does not appear to address the potentially significant adverse impacts to the Gliderport Facility and activities or loss of recreational opportunities. Why is this analysis omitted, particularly where the DEIR, Figure 3.4-5, indicates Academic, Administrative and undefined Sports & Recreation uses in all of the UCSD-owned Gliderport area? Also, where the DEIR acknowledges that the La Jolla Public Facilities Financing Plan for Fiscal Year 2002 finds that the parks in the La Jolla area do NOT presently meet the City's standards for population-based park acreage? (DEIR, pages 4.12-4 through 4.12-5).

3. Impacts to National Register Listed or Eligible Properties. Mention is made that the Gliderport is listed on the National Register of Historic Places at DEIR, page 4.4-4, and that impacts would occur to the site (UCSD's portion includes the runway for launching full-scale gliders) from LRDP development. (DEIR pages 4.4-29; 4.8-22). Yet, it appears analysis of the potentially adverse impacts to this status and its historic uses from the LRDP activities, is absent in the DEIR, and is being deferred to some future point in time. (DEIR, table 4.4-3). Thus, insufficient information has been disclosed in the DEIR to determine whether the bulk and density of the proposed facilities on that property will impact the Gliderport's integrity, historic use and setting. Does this mean that when specific development is proposed, that a tiered environmental document will be produced and be subject to public review and comment?

Moreover, the Salk Institute has recently also been nominated to the National Register. The DEIR finds that the views cast towards the UCSD campus including the Gliderport and Salk properties are among those considered the most visually sensitive areas. (DEIR, pages 4.16 through 4.1-7). The DEIR concludes for other impacts that the LRDP would substantially degrade existing visual character even with mitigation. (DEIR, page 4.1-31). Yet, the DEIR does not appear to analyze the issue of the views from scenic coastal areas such as Torrey Pines City Park to these two historic properties. Why were these issues omitted?

The UCSD Design Review Board meets regularly, typically on a monthly basis. The meetings are not publicly noticed and are not generally open to the public. Environmental review for each project occurs during the planning phase of project development. Public input on campus projects is accommodated through the public review period for each environmental
4. **Displacement and Sufficiency of Parking.** The DEIR acknowledges that Torrey Pines Scenic Road and Salk Institute Road are among the streets most affected by UCSD-affiliated parking (DEIR, page 4.13-21). Yet, the DEIR also states that new development would be “unlikely” to conflict with Salk Institute to the south. (DEIR, page 4.8-22). This appears unsubstantiated: for example, UCSD development at the Gliderport property would further restrict Salk parking by eliminating the dirt lot Salk currently leases from UCSD on a short-term basis. Further, the DEIR admits that that additional parking off-campus would happen if a substantial parking deficiency occurs which is the result of UCSD not providing adequate parking supply. Yet, we understand that parking inventories have already documented that UCSD students park in the Salk lot described above. How have the existing and expected impacts to Salk’s parking been quantified, analyzed and accounted for in the DEIR?

O27-8

Further, we note that UCSD has not submitted its LRDP to the Coastal Commission and instead intends to submit plans for development in the Coastal Zone on a project-by-project basis. (DEIR, page 4.8-10). When will UCSD examine impacts to the public’s existing and expected Coastal access parking availability and quantify and analyze the impacts in a public environmental document?

O27-9

5. **Limiting Potential to Partner with the Salk Institute.** The DEIR does not appear to address the potential for mutually beneficial partnerships including those related to shared or joint facilities such as recreational, daycare, parking, alternative transportation and other uses, which may provide support facilities and mitigation measures for projects within in the area, including UCSD’s LRDP developments. Why is so little focus on partnerships with neighboring uses made in the DEIR? If such efforts have been tried but not proven fruitful, please describe those efforts to date and their outcome. Any follow-up on our prior efforts to discuss these matters with UCSD Physical Planning have not been communicated to us.

O27-10

6. **Cumulatively Considerable and Unmitigable Traffic Impacts.** The DEIR concludes that the LRDP will contribute to or cause regional decreases in traffic level of service. (DEIR, page 4.13-72). What cumulative impacts will this have on other Institution’s abilities to expand? What additional impacts will occur to Torrey Pines Scenic Road along the Gliderport property and access to the Torrey Pines City Park? If UCSD does not take a lead on mitigating these impacts and improving mobility, what burdens and costs might be shifted to other institutions and jurisdictions?

O27-11

7. **Outdoor Lighting Plan for Development on the Gliderport Property.** The DEIR concludes that there could be cumulative aesthetic effects related to nighttime lighting. (DEIR, page 4.1-38). Proposals for UCSD development in this part of its campus appear conceptual, at best, and are not well articulated document, rather than through the design review process. Public comments made during the environmental review process are provided to The Regents as they consider project approval. Regental meetings are public and are noticed.

O27-7

The site conditions for each project are described in project-level environmental documents that are available for public review and comment. Possible land use incompatibilities would be addressed in project-level environmental documents.

O27-8

UCSD believes that the Draft EIR’s conclusion regarding potential conflicts with the Salk Institute are sound. As indicated by the commentor, parking on the Gliderport property is leased by the Salk Institute on a short-term basis. Because the lease is short-term and the Salk Institute has excess developable parking space capacity under the applicable community plan, this is not viewed as a substantial conflict. The Draft EIR does indicate that significant parking impacts could occur if adequate parking supply were not provided, but it also concludes that adequate parking supply is currently provided and under the 2004 LRDP will continue to be provided. In addition, mitigation measure TrA-2A is provided to ensure that the campus parking supply remains adequate. UCSD is not aware of any inventories that documented students parking in the Salk Institute lot. All inventories that have been conducted by UCSD have been for UCSD parking lots and public roads.

Parking capacity impacts for both on-campus and off-campus parking capacity are addressed in the Draft EIR in Section 4.13.3.2. This analysis includes potential coastal access related parking. In addition, subsequent environmental documents prepared for future development projects would tier from the Final EIR and would include a project-specific analysis of coastal access parking effects if applicable. In previous permit actions, the Coastal Commission has found that because of adequate parking supply on campus, that UCSD development does not have substantial adverse impacts on recreational access parking.

O27-9

The Draft EIR addresses shared use facilities to the extent relevant. Many of UCSD’s facilities and amenities are currently available for public use and this is accounted for in the Draft EIR. In addition, the Draft EIR also accounts for the use of off-campus facilities by UCSD related populations. It is not apparent to UCSD why addressing a partnership with the Salk Institute is relevant to the Draft EIR. Such a partnership is not an objective of the 2004 LRDP, nor is it evident that it would reduce or avoid significant impacts associated with implementation of the 2004 LRDP. However, while developing mutual partnerships with the Salk Institute and other entities is not considered an objective of the 2004 LRDP, the Draft EIR does not inhibit the potential future development of such partnerships.

O27-10
Present and probable future projects within the City of San Diego are accounted for in the cumulative traffic analysis provided in the Draft EIR (Section 4.13). The City of San Diego approved the current version of the University Community Plan with significant and unavoidable traffic impacts. Therefore, the City is aware of the traffic impacts on its roadways. UCSD is not in a position to speculate on City decisions regarding projects under their jurisdiction. Section 4.13 of the Draft EIR addresses traffic and parking impacts that could affect access to Torrey Pines Scenic Drive and the Torrey Pines City Park. The Draft EIR concludes that implementation of the 2004 LRDP would not result in significant impacts to Torrey Pines Scenic Road or parking for Torrey Pines City Park. The traffic impact of UCSD Gliderport development will need to be examined in detail in a subsequent environmental document when development is proposed.

The detailed information of interest to the commentor is unavailable for the Draft EIR as it is a program level document (see Response L2-1). Future proposed development of the Gliderport property would undergo a project-specific environmental review in a subsequent environmental document tiered from the 2004 LRDP EIR. The subsequent environmental review would include the analysis of aesthetics impacts, including light and glare impacts, and would be available for public review and comment at that time.

The EIR prepared for the 2004 LRDP is a Program EIR pursuant to state CEQA Guidelines section 15168(a) with certain project level components. A Program EIR is an EIR prepared for a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project. A Program EIR prepared for a project such as the LRDP cannot be as comprehensive, specific, or as detailed as a Project Level EIR. When specific projects are proposed, the projects will undergo project-level environmental review. Accordingly, the level of environmental review in this Program EIR is appropriate and adequate pursuant to CEQA.

UCSD to the extent feasible provided a detailed description of the expected development and a detailed analysis of its environmental impacts. This detail is provided throughout the Draft EIR, including the nine technical appendices included in Volume II of the Draft EIR. Chapter 6, Alternatives, of the Draft EIR presents a reasonable range of alternatives including the Increased Density Alternative, Alternative Location for Additional Campus Growth, No Project Alternative, No Campus Growth Alternative, Constrained Development Alternative, and the Increased Campus Housing Alternative. The project alternatives analyzed are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening significant effects associated with the project and could impede to some degree the attainment of project objectives or would be more costly. As identified on page 6-1 of the Draft EIR, Section 15126.6(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines directs that “…the significant effects of the alternatives shall be discussed, but
in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.” Excluding the No Project and No Campus Growth Alternatives, the EIR identifies the Constrained Development Alternative as the environmentally superior alternative. All of these alternatives are analyzed in Chapter 6.0 of the Draft EIR, but in less detail than the significant effects of the proposed project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O27-14</td>
<td>UCSD believes that the Draft EIR adequately addresses the environmental consequences that could result from implementation of the proposed 2004 LRDP and that relevant community concerns have been addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O27-15</td>
<td>The University seeks to work cooperatively with its neighbors. No specific solutions or collaborations that are relevant to the potential impacts of the 2004 LRDP are identified. Therefore, further response is not possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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 A. 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
Catherine Presnyk  
UCSD Physical Planning Office  
9500 Gilman Drive, M.C. 0965  
San Diego, CA 92093-0965  

By Mail and Confirmed Fax: 858.822.5990  
September 12, 2003

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

Dear Ms. Presnyk:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for consideration of our comments.

Very truly yours,

FILE

Courtney Ann Coyle
Attorney at Law

Cc: Hon. Scott Peters, Councilmember
Laurinda Owens, California Coastal Commission
La Jolla Farms Homeowners Association
La Jolla Shores Association
La Jolla Town Council
Client file
O28-1

Sept 9, 2004
Katherine Presmyk
Physical Planning UCSD
950 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA 92037-0965

Re: Noise/trash problems at UCSD Shuttle Bus Stops

Whom It May Concern:

As a resident of Villas Mallorca on Villa La Jolla Drive, I find the noise level and frequency of buses running until midnight unacceptable. I was told the quiet natural gas engines were ordered incorrectly and do not have the power to go uphill with passengers. Also, the trash being left at bus stops is a disgrace. I was told the students cannot find the trash on the buses.

These problems are severely impacting the neighborhood. I hope the necessary steps will be taken to correct these issues.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard Burke
Student
Villa La Jolla

O28-1 Refer to Response O7-1.
From: <CLRGST@aol.com>
To: <cppresmyk@ucsd.edu>
Cc: <mlav@sandiego.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 09, 2004 10:26 AM
Subject: (no subject)

Catherine Presmyk
Physical Planning UCSD

O29-1

In a recent HOA board meeting held at Woodlands La Jolla a great deal of concern and frustration were voiced by the residents secondary to the problems that they are encountering with parking due to the UCSD shuttle buses. Not only are the streets full of student's cars, the shuttle buses are quite noisy and disruptive. The Woodlands is at Via Alcante and Via Mallorca on the East side of Via Mallorca, with a shuttle bus stop directly in front. Many of the residents felt very frustrated as invited guests are unable to find parking.

Previously when students were allowed to ride the city bus for free this problem did not exist. Also currently during the summer months, when the shuttle buses are not running, again we are able to find ample parking in the streets.

We feel that students are being encouraged to park free in our neighborhood without concern for the residents. This appears to be an easy solution to parking problems on campus both for UCSD and for the students, but it has been very disruptive for the Woodlands home owners.

As a member of the Board of Directors of the Woodlands HOA we encourage you to study this problem more thoroughly and look for more adequate parking arrangements for the students.

I previously spoke with Madeleine Lee about the problem and requested that 2 hour parking signs be posted in our area, or that resident designations be made for the street parking areas.

We encourage you to have a further open meeting for us to be able to voice our input for solutions to alleviate these problems.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Clare Stevens, Treasurer
Woodlands HOA
Review comments to the University of California San Diego (UCSD) 2004 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

To Whom It May Concern:

As long time resident homeowners', 20+ years at 8638-4 Villa La Jolla Drive, my wife Maria and I have been actively involved in our surrounding local community and within University City for as many years. As graduates and current employees with UCSD (combined 47+ years of service) coupled with our ongoing voluntary community service gives us a unique background and perspective to comment on this current 2004 LRDP and Draft EIR.

We'll be commenting primarily on sections 4.9 Noise & 4.13 Transportation, Traffic, and Parking of the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR as applicable to our immediate local community and with regards to the negative impacts generated by the UCSD City Shuttle (City Shuttle) bus service system.

Specifically, the approximate geographical location of our impacted local community are immediately south of the main UCSD campus and encompass Villa La Jolla Drive (running approximately north/south from La Jolla Village Drive to Gilman), Via Mallorca, Via Alicante and Gilman Drive (exiting south and running approximately southeast/southwest of the main campus to Via Alicante). Our local area contains substantial residential complexes including 16 condominium homeowner associations (HOAs). It is important to distinguish between residential “rental” complexes and residential HOAs that include their resident homeowners whom live within our local area, discussed below.

After many meetings with local area HOAs board members, the La Jolla Village Community Association and numerous concerned resident homeowners it is evident that the City Shuttle bus system, deployed in the fall of 2002, has been "the single most negatively impacting event" in our local area history in the past 20+ years! These negative impacts include, but are not limited to, constant (starting from 7AM until past midnight) and frequent (every 7 minutes & more frequently during peak times) vehicular shuttle bus traffic and noise, trash at bus stops, lack of available on and off street residential parking, encroachment onto HOA properties from shuttle riders (including the parking of cars & bikes on these private properties), and impacted local retail business parking. Our community had a unique quality; at approximately 7-8 PM every evening it got quiet and by 10PM very quiet. The City Shuttle bus system has taken that away from us all.

UCSD takes the neighborhood concerns regarding the shuttle seriously and is working to find solutions to those concerns. Refer to Response O7-1. The commentor has not been excluded from the EIR process. As discussed in the Draft EIR, there have been two public scoping meetings and two 30-day comment periods in the last year during which time the commentor could have provided input on the Draft EIR and proposed 2004 LRDP. No comments were submitted by the commentor during those times. With regard to Sections 4.9 and 4.13 of the Draft EIR, as discussed in Section 4.9, the noise analysis is based upon traffic volumes identified in the Traffic Analysis Report (Appendix I), which is used in both the noise and transportation, traffic, and parking analyses. Therefore, the analysis of these two environmental topics is integrated in the Draft EIR and UCSD believes that existing conditions and project impacts are accurately represented.
COMMENTS

O30-1 (cont.)

A brief meeting, including myself and only one other local area resident homeowner, with was held on May 25, 2004 with UCSD representatives from Governmental & Community Relations, Parking, and Transportation campus offices to discuss and address some of the above impacts on our local community. It was discovered that the initial UCSD City Shuttle “market survey” for ridership “excluded” all of our 16 local area HOA’s comprising all of the local area “resident homeowners!” We were and continue to be excluded from this LRDP and Draft EIR process and this fact is evident as detailed, or lack their of, within the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR.

Turning to the two sections of the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR, 4.9 Noise & 4.13 Transportation, Traffic, and Parking, it’s clear that both “noise” and “transportation, traffic and parking” are at many levels “conjoined at the hip” and cannot be separated. By separating and not integrating the two in turn lead to mitigation issue summaries that do not encompass factual “before & after” conclusions.

Issues requiring address:

1) The local area “resident homeowners,” as described above, have not been properly noticed nor included in this LRDP and it’s Draft EIR process. This includes the deployment of the UCSD City Shuttle bus system within our local area. Until this significant residential group of homeowners are included in this overall process, and their inputs/concerns addressed, a delay is requested and required in the upcoming Regents’ September 2004 approval/disapproval vote on the pending UCSD 2004 LRDP and its’ Draft EIR.

2) Traffic and noise are not separate issues: If UCSD is going to project into our local community very noisy and impacting equipment, the City Shuttle bus system, it is requested and required that a “baseline” ambient CNEL sound level measurements be taken, as described and outlined on page 4.9-4 “now,” before the full UCSD 2004/05 academic year begins. NOTE: Many of our local resident homeowners live but a “sidewalk” distance away from these noisy bus routes & stops and require the benefit of proper noise measurements, including ambient, steady state and peak times to insure proper mitigation. The results may show that the “City of San Diego Noise Land Use Compatibility Levels,” as shown in Table 4.9-2 (page 4.9-17), cannot be met nor mitigated for our local area resident homeowners and others that live in and around this shuttle bus system.

3) To assist in this City Shuttle bus system baseline data collection that will lead to mitigating impacts from noise, trash, encroachment, etc., it is requested that for no less than one academic quarter during 2004/05, an alternate City Shuttle bus route be tested within our local community. Specifically, all City Shuttle buses use an alternative route that does not traverse our local community as detailed above. For example, City Shuttle buses could travel Gilman south to I-5, north I-5 to Nobel, east on Nobel to Genesee (UTC area), return on the same course or onto La Jolla Village Drive. NOTE: It is requested that during this test our local area resident homeowners have proper and timely notification of this testing period.

RESPONSES

O30-2

As discussed in the Draft EIR, the NOP, scoping meetings, and comment periods were noticed in accordance with CEQA. The initiation of the UCSD City Shuttle bus system is not a part of the proposed project, but rather is an existing program and thus is part of the existing conditions. Refer to Response O7-1 for further discussion. The 2004 LRDP and LRDP EIR are scheduled to be considered, along with all comments and responses, by The Regents at the September 2004 Regents meeting.

O30-3

Refer to Responses O30-2 and O7-1. Because the shuttle bus operations are existing, that is, the shuttle bus system was operating at the time the NOP was published and they are considered part of the baseline. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to purposely exclude them from the existing setting considered for the 2004 LRDP.

O30-4

Refer to Responses O30-2, O30-3, and O7-1.
Implementation of such a parking program is not within UCSD’s jurisdiction. Refer to Response O5-1.

Refer to Response O7-1.

Refer to Responses O12-2, O5-1, and O7-1.

As discussed in Section 4.13.3.2 of the Draft EIR, the UCSD campus has set its parking target at a ratio of 0.41 spaces per capita, which maintains a 90 percent peak parking occupancy and is equivalent to the industry standard. Having space per capita and vacancy goals instead of a designated number of parking spaces ensures that the on-campus parking supply would keep pace with the future campus population. This means that as campus population increases, so would the available parking supply. See also Response O5-1.

The proposed 2004 LRDP includes year round sessions to the extent feasible. As shown in Table 3.4-1 of the Draft EIR, under the proposed 2004 LRDP regular academic year enrollment is projected to increase by 30 percent while summer session enrollment could increase by 190 percent. However, the summer session population is expected to be no more than about three-fourths of the regular year population. In addition, a reasonable range of project alternatives is evaluated in the Draft EIR in Chapter 6. Future enrollment increases over and above the total identified in the 2004 LRDP, if any, would be required to be evaluated under CEQA.

UCSD believes that the commentor’s streets have been adequately addressed in the Draft EIR. Because the commentor does not specifically indicate what should be readdressed, further response to this issue is not possible. In comment O30-1, the commentor identifies four streets in their vicinity. Two are included in the list on page 4.13-21. The other two, Via Mallocre and Via Alicante, will be added to the list in the Final EIR. Refer also to Responses O5-1 and O7-1.

Refer to Response O7-1 regarding the modification of shuttle bus routes.
11) City Shuttle bus system ridership: It is requested that the ridership after 6PM be reviewed. After peak hours many buses run nearly empty. Adjust, combine or eliminate routes after 8PM in all community areas.

12) City Shuttle bus system ridership: It is requested that the ridership end at 8PM in our local community so we may relax and have peace and quiet.

13) City Shuttle bus system ADT's: It is requested that the ADT's from this bus system be addressed, counted and included in our local areas' traffic study, UCSD LRDP and Draft EIR to show its' overall impacts.

14) Roadway segment mitigation: It is requested that data be generated and included in the current LRDP and Draft EIR as outlined on pages 4.13-45 thru 63 to address the impacts of the City Shuttle bus system on our local community streets and intersections. Again our area has been left out of this part of the review.

Corrected facts: page 4.13-72, our local area will not benefit from FBA projects funds to lessen the impacts from the City Shuttle bus system; page 4.13-18, our local area experiences severe on street parking impacts as a direct result of the City Shuttle bus system.

In closing, our community looks forward to your responses and actions to address the various negative impacts from your City Shuttle bus system. As stated in paragraph 4.13.3.1, it is also requested that UCSB rethink its statement in light of current events and outcomes in our local community. Specifically, the impacts of this program are direct and dramatic and have turned our local communities' available on-street parking into an alternative "free" parking lot for UCSB's use. Whenever "free" bus shuttle services are coupled with "free" parking, the greater San Diego UCSD student, faculty and staff will come into that area and use it! It's no longer about ridership, it's about community! As a responsible community member, UCSD must address their lack of available on-campus parking, on campus. It should not look to balance its' lack of long-range planning and parking shortages on the backs of our local community.

Dale & Maria Disharoon
Resident Homeowners
8638-4 Villa La Jolla Drive
La Jolla, CA 92037-2363
Email: ddisharoon@ucsd.edu

Refer to Response O7-1 regarding the modification of shuttle bus routes.

Trip generation resulting from the operation of the UCSD shuttle bus system is included in the overall trip generation identified and assessed in Section 4.13.3.1 of the Draft EIR. The vehicle trips generated from the operation of the Cityshuttle service are only a very small fraction of the overall trips to and from the campus on a daily basis. The basis for the traffic study area analyzed is described in the Draft EIR in Section 4.13 and in greater detail in the traffic appendix. Streets and intersections immediately adjacent to the commentor's location did not meet the criteria identified in the Draft EIR for inclusion in the study area.

The commentor provides two statements that appear to refute information provided in the Draft EIR. However, the commentor does not identify what specific information they are referring to (instead an entire page is cited) or attempt to provide an explanation of why the EIR statements are incorrect. UCSD believes the information on the two cited pages to be accurate. Without additional information, further response is not possible.

Refer to Response O5-1 and O7-1.
NAME: Maher, Pamela  
DATE: July 9, 2004

LRDP EIR COMMENTS:
As neighbors of the UCSD campus, Scripps Estates Associates (SEA) has several serious concerns regarding the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) which are not adequately addressed in the recently presented Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Although as part of this plan, UCSD proposes to increase the campus population 50% from the current level of 33,100 students, faculty and staff to 49,700 students, faculty and staff within the next 15 years, the impacts that this increase will have on neighboring residential communities such as SEA are given little or no consideration in the EIR. Since a 50% increase in the campus population is likely to have major impacts on both traffic and the overall environment of the neighboring communities, the EIR should have taken these concerns more seriously. Instead, most of the traffic mitigation measures are directed towards the east side of UCSD and there are no plans to address the problems associated with students, faculty and staff parking in the residential communities. Since UCSD does not propose to increase the on-campus parking space to population ratio (currently 0.41), this means that the 50% increase in population will only exacerbate the already serious problems associated with the daily search by students, faculty and staff for parking spaces in SEA.

A second concern arises from the plans to increase development on UCSD properties. Although the SIO property adjacent to SEA (where the tennis court is located) is now slated for “academic” development, the mitigation plans for that development provide no means to address the concerns of the neighbors who will be directly impacted by this development. While the EIR noted that development of this property will have significant impacts on aesthetics and land use, the mitigation plan simply requires the review of the development by an additional UCSD committee. It would seem much more appropriate for the development to be reviewed by a committee composed of community members and neighbor rather than just UCSD employees since the latter are unlikely to be familiar with the concerns of the people who will be directly impacted by the development.

A third concern arises from the archeological resources that are found on several sites near SEA. Although the EIR recognizes the potential importance of these sites, the mitigation plan appears to be primarily directed at getting the buildings built rather than towards preserving the archeological resources, thereby allowing the acquisition of greater knowledge about the earlier inhabitants of this area. This attitude is particularly troubling given that it is coming from an Institute of “higher learning”.

O31-1  Traffic impacts are addressed in Section 4.13 of the Draft EIR. Other impacts to neighboring communities are also addressed in the Draft EIR, such as in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, and 4.8, Land Use and Planning. Feasible mitigation measures were identified in the Draft EIR based on anticipated significant impacts. The commentor does not specifically identify what impacts are not adequately addressed; therefore, further response is not possible. Refer to Responses O5-1 and O30-8 regarding the UCSD target parking ratio. Off-campus parking capacity is addressed in Section 4.13.3.2 of the Draft EIR.

O31-2  No project is currently proposed for the property identified by the commentor. When a specific project is proposed, that project will be evaluated in a CEQA document subject to public review. The mitigation measures referred to by the commentor (believed to be Aes-1A, Aes-1B, and Lan-2A) provide for the review of the project and they also specify a number of design measures that could be implemented to mitigate impacts. Those mitigation measures would be incorporated into the project before it circulated for review, so that the public will be able to see the project specifics at that time. Refer to O27-6 and O27-7 regarding public input on the Design Review Board and Physical Planning Department review processes. Community members and neighbors who have requested information on University CEQA projects will receive notification.

O31-3  Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, of the Draft EIR sets forth mitigation that are expected to mitigate impacts to levels that are less than significant to the extent feasible, consistent with applicable state and federal regulations. Project specific analysis will evaluate whether additional mitigations are needed for a specific project.
UCSD says that it wants to be a good neighbor and a good citizen, implying that SEA and the other nearby communities should trust them “to do the right thing” when it comes to expanding the campus population by 50% over the next 15 years. However, the EIR indicates that the “right thing” primarily takes into account what is good for UCSD and not what is good for nearby communities or the rest of San Diego. UCSD needs to fully justify its need to expand its population and, if this expansion is deemed necessary by all concerned, then it should have the oversight of the City of San Diego as well as the planning boards of the surrounding communities which will be directly impacted. It is time that UCSD acknowledge that it is part of a much larger community and, as such, obey all the rules of that community. We urge the UC Board of Regents to withhold approval of the EIR and the LRDP until UCSD adequately includes the larger community of which it is a part in its development plans.

HOPKINS PARKING STRUCTURE COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.

SAN DIEGO SUPERCOMPUTER EXPANSION COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.

RADY SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT FACILITY COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.

Increases in enrollment at UCSD would be in accordance with the Master Plan for Higher Education in California, which guarantees access to the University of California for the top 12.5 percent of California’s public high school graduates and community college transfer students. See Section 1.1 of the Draft EIR for a more detailed discussion. The 2004 LRDP and LRDP EIR are scheduled to be considered, along with all comments and responses, by The Regents at the September 2004 Regents meeting. See also Response O25-26.
NAME: David, Gary
DATE: July 10, 2004

LRDP EIR COMMENTS:

1. Since detailed analysis is only presented for three projects (Rady, Supercomputer and Hopkins Parking), and details of the many other potential projects have been “backed out” of the plan, it is unclear to me to what level they have been included in the EIR. For example, projects that will have profound impact on our neighborhood include ECEC, the development of the field at the corner of Torrey Pines Road and North Torrey Pines Road and the parking facility to be located in the theater district (La Jolla Playhouse). Where are these and other planned projects in the timeframe included, and how have they been addressed in this EIR?

We are especially concerned about the development of the eucalyptus grove adjacent to Azul and North Torrey Pines Road and what steps the University will take to avoid increased traffic, safety and noise in adjacent properties. The 25 mph speed limit, for example, on Expedition Way has never been enforced, and crossing that road, especially in traffic-blind regions is quite hazardous. The Eucalyptus grove itself not only serves as a natural preserve, but as noise control. Your maps and our recent experiences with proposed ECEC and housing discussions show little of the grove retained.

2. The planned growth of campus (obviously, this includes the total campus population, which is expected to expand at a much greater rate than the student population) during the period of the LRDP is enormous. Surrounding traffic and parking problems are already considerable.

It was pointed out at a recent presentation of the LRDP that coordination with other facilities” (e.g., Salk, Scripps Clinic and Research, The Burnham Institute, and others) planned growth does not appear to have been incorporated in the LRDP. I would submit that an EIR that has not been intimately coordinated with EIRs from other developing institutions and the local communities in general is by definition flawed and inaccurate.

3. One suggestion which we might offer for consideration: At the University of Illinois, which we attended in the “60’s, undergraduates were not allowed to live off campus, except for their senior year, when those with acceptable academic achievements were allowed to petition for off campus housing. Couple this

The Draft EIR is a Program EIR that addresses the 2004 LRDP at a program level. Refer to Response L2-1 and Chapter 1 of the Draft EIR. The only building projects proposed at the current time are the ones included in the document. As other projects are planned, they will be put forward for project-specific environmental review.

As shown in Figures 3.4-4 and -5 of the Draft EIR, an approximate 60-foot setback consisting of the Grove Reserve would be maintained between Azul Street and campus development. Traffic and noise would be anticipated to increase with the 2004 LRDP, however, implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR would reduce impact where feasible to levels that are less than significant. Program level traffic and noise are addressed in Sections 4.13 and 4.9 of the Draft EIR. These comments are primarily focused on a specific future project. It is not the purpose of this EIR to address project specific impacts but rather to address the broader issues associated with program implementation (Refer to Response L2-1). Project information and subsequent detailed environmental review will be provided for specific future projects. This information will be provided to community groups and project neighbors.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b), the analysis of cumulative environmental impacts in the Draft EIR includes past, present, and probable future projects, including a list of 17 present and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, as well as the consideration of projects that could be implemented to fully execute adopted community plans, such as the San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan and La Jolla and University community plans. The cumulative impact analysis is provided within each of the 14 topics addressed in the Draft EIR. Refer also to Comment and Response O27-10, and Response O25-26.

The commentor’s suggestion regarding campus housing would require UCSD to substantially expand on-campus housing. Expansion of this magnitude would likely not be feasible due to the cost and space requirements and market demand considerations. Increasing on-campus housing beyond that projected in the proposed 2004 LRDP is evaluated in the Increased Campus Housing Alternative found in Chapter 6 of the Draft EIR. With regard to the commentor’s suggestion for vehicles, as discussed in Section 4.13.1.6, a new parking policy, which would restrict the first-year resident students from bringing cars to campus, is being considered by UCSD.
regulation with an automobile ban for at least the freshman year and traffic and parking problems would be reduced considerably. [And, who knows, grades might improve significantly!]

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment. We look forward to your responses.

HOPKINS PARKING STRUCTURE COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.

SAN DIEGO SUPERCOMPUTER EXPANSION COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.

RACY SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT FACILITY COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.
COMMENTS

NAME: Dickins, David
DATE: July 11, 2004

LRDP EIR COMMENTS:
As residents literally “across the street” from the main UCSD campus and adjacent to the Birch Aquarium entrance road, we are part of a unique residential island surrounded on three sides by University controlled lands. Although not called out specifically in the LRDP, we understand that the University has had plans for some time to construct a child development center in the grove of trees at the end of Poole Street. This development will result in a series of impacts which concern us greatly: (1) reduce the natural noise buffer afforded by the grove, (2) diminish the beauty and habitat represented by the grove - any open space is precious in the current frenzied growth environment of San Diego and (3) significantly change the peaceful nature of our residential area by introducing a high level of traffic as parents seek easy access to the center. We would like to see any such development planned so as to minimize disturbance to the Grove and planned to accommodate the required traffic load, particularly at peak periods (morning and afternoon).

On another issue, we feel that allowing UCSD students to park all day throughout the surrounding neighborhoods (ours being one) is the “easy” way out. Longer term solutions to parking “blight” needs to be found through rapid transit links to the campus and defined park and ride sites.

HOPKINS PARKING STRUCTURE COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.

SAN DIEGO SUPERCOMPUTER EXPANSION COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.

Rady School of Management Facility Comments:
No comment on this section.

RESPONSES

O33-1 Traffic and noise are addressed in Sections 4.13 and 4.9 of the Draft EIR respectively. Because the comments are primarily on a specific future project, refer also to Response L2-1. Refer to Response O5-1 regarding existing parking impacts to local residential streets.
NAME: Duffey, Michael
DATE: July 16, 2004

LRDP EIR COMMENTS:
Strongly recommend that UCSD parking and facilities management lease “off-site” parking (park-n-ride) from private shopping center owners e.g. Von’s shopping center located on Arriba/Regents Road and Ralphs located at Villa La Jolla Drive for the specific purpose of mitigating for the loss of public parking on public streets near/adjacent to shuttle bus stops and homeowner associations.

Leasing spaces in private centers would help to elevate the public’s concerns regarding loss of tenant/owner parking due to excessive use by UCSD students and mitigate a major concern of residents who live near UCSD shuttle service.

The public clearly benefits from the current UCSD shuttle and applauds the University for implementing this system, we do however strongly feel UCSD can and should mitigate some of the parking issues related to “off-site” issues associated with student-facility ridership. The cost to lease off-site parking spaces from private property owners creates a win-win strategy, creating a safe and monitored area for students/facility to park their vehicles, generates community good will, compensates private owners for security/loss of customer parking and rewards UCSD ridership with a protected and safe parking environment in which to park.

HOPKINS PARKING STRUCTURE COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.

SAN DIEGO SUPERCOMPUTER EXPANSION COMMENTS:
No comment on this section.

Rady School of Management Facility Comments:
No comment on this section.

O34-1 As discussed in Response O5-1, UCSD does not believe that leasing off-site parking would be an effective or feasible solution at this time because capacity is still available during peak hours in on-campus parking lots; it would not be an effective deterrent to those parking on the residential streets until parking restrictions on those streets are in place; and associated costs. In addition, the parking spaces provided by private developments are typically based on minimum City requirements so locating excess capacity for lease would be difficult.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From: Michael Wijas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To: <a href="mailto:rclossin@ucsd.edu">rclossin@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cc: <a href="mailto:Mduffey@ucsd.edu">Mduffey@ucsd.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent: Monday, July 19, 2004 5:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: City shuttle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Sir or Madam:

I am a resident of the Villas Mallorca’s condominium complex which is located near the Campus. I have been residing at 8606-5 Villa Mallorca Drive since 1995. It has come to my attention that a certain resident of my complex has voiced complaints relative to the city shuttle; alleging that it has been disruptive to the residents here.

I am writing to make sure that you understand that this individual does not speak for me, or to my knowledge, for anyone but himself/herself.

As to me, the contrary is true. I have experienced no such disruptive activity since the initiation of the shuttle service. I might add that I work out of my home and I have had the experience to witness, first hand, the activity the shuttle service generates before rush hour, during the day and the evening rush hour.

I believe that the greatest problem that this city currently faces is traffic congestion. The city shuttle is a partial solution to that issue that should go forward. In the event that you care to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to call me.

Michael J. Wijas Esq.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O35-1 UCSD appreciates the commentor’s support of the Cityshuttle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
NAME: Arovas, Daniel  
DATE: July 20, 2004  

LRDP EIR COMMENTS:  
The traffic study for the LRDP assumed that both the Regents Road bridge and Genesee Avenue widening projects would be built, since they are included in the adopted University Community Plan. However, these projects are the subject of an ongoing EIR study, and one or both of them may never be built. A third structural project, grade separation at Genesee Avenue and Governor Drive, is also under consideration in this University City North/South Transportation Corridor EIR study.  

UCSD’s traffic study should consider all the possibilities currently under consideration in the UC North/South Corridor Study EIR: (1) Regents Road bridge, (2) Genesee Avenue widening, (3) Genesee/Governor grade separation, (4) bridge plus widening, (5) bridge plus grade separation, and (6) no project.  

HOPKINS PARKING STRUCTURE COMMENTS:  
No comment on this section.  

SAN DIEGO SUPERCOMPUTER EXPANSION COMMENTS:  
No comment on this section.  

RADY SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT FACILITY COMMENTS:  
No comment on this section.  

RESPONSES:  
The level of trip generation associated with the 2004 LRDP for UCSD is consistent with the University Community Plan and will not add trips beyond levels anticipated in the Community Plan. Accordingly, the traffic analysis for the 2004 LRDP is focused on analyzing the surrounding roadway network in conformance with the University Community Plan Circulation Element. The traffic analysis for the 2004 LRDP (as well as traffic analyses for other projects in the area) was coordinated with the City of San Diego and is based on forecast data from the SANDAG Series 9 transportation model.  

UCSD recognizes that the three future transportation projects from the University City North/South Transportation Corridor Study that are included in the traffic analysis 2010 and 2020 scenarios may never be built. This is disclosed on pages 4.13-32 and -35 of the Draft EIR. However, based on coordination with the City, these improvements were identified as probable future projects. They are also consistent with the University Community Plan Circulation Element and the North University City (NUC) FBA. The Draft EIR (as well as the adopted University Community Plan EIR) concludes that cumulative impacts to regional roads would be significant and unavoidable. Therefore, there would be no change to these conclusions if the projects were not built. In addition, as discussed in the Draft EIR, 2004 LRDP traffic distribution to these segments is relatively low, between two and six percent.  

Independently of the UCSD 2004 LRDP traffic analysis, the City of San Diego is currently preparing a UC North/South Corridor Study traffic analysis and EIR. This City study specifically focuses on a number of network alternatives in the UC area and will develop the appropriate information upon which to base decisions for possible changes to the adopted Circulation Element. For the UC North/South Corridor Study, the City is using forecast data from the recently adopted SANDAG Series 10 transportation model.
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University Community Planning Group
Making the University Community Planning Group the Finest
in the City of San Diego

July 21, 2004

Mr. Jeffrey A. Steindorf
Assistant Vice Chancellor, Campus Planning
University of California, San Diego
UCSD Campus Planning
9500 Gilman Drive, MC 0965
San Diego, CA 92093-0965

Dear Chancellor Steindorf,

The UCPG Executive Committee has reviewed the UCSD 2004 LRDP EIR and
our comments follow.

This letter supersedes a previous resolution submitted by representatives of the
University Community Planning Group (UCPG) on July 8, 2004.

Please note that the resolution of July 8, 2004 from the four members of the UCPG
Subcommittee, Stanley Siegel, Chair, UCPG; Linda Colley, Vice Chair, UCPG and
Chair, Subcommittee, UCSD-EIR; Charles, Herzfeld, UCPG, member of the
Subcommittee, and Michael G. Duffey, UCPG General Member, member of the
Subcommittee, UCSD-EIR has been withdrawn by the UCPG and no longer
carries an official endorsement.

We, the Executive Committee members of the University Community Planning
Group (UCPG) respectfully request that UCSD incorporate and consider the following:

1) Commit to solving the direct and cumulative impacts as identified in the EIR.

2) Define in scope, commit to implementation and controlled measures, and
mitigate and monitor the cumulative impacts of 4.9 Noise and 4.13
Transportation, Traffic, and Parking as identified in the EIR.

3) Maintain and increase the capacity of the shuttle system while addressing
concerns of the immediate communities as to the operational details of the
shuttle system.

RESPONSES

The comment provides a list of requests, each of which are addressed in the
following:

1) Mitigation measures are identified as feasible for all significant direct
and cumulative impacts identified in the Draft EIR. UCSD is
committed to implementing feasible mitigation measures for direct
and cumulative impacts associated with the 2004 LRDP. However,
UCSD does not have the jurisdiction or ability to solve many of the
traffic problems in the vicinity because the are city and state roads and
the City’s University Community Plan was adopted with significant
and unavoidable traffic impacts.

2) The Draft EIR concluded that implementation of the proposed 2004
LRDP would not cumulatively contribute to a significant noise
impact. Therefore, no mitigation is required. Feasible mitigation mea-
sures are identified in Section 4.13, Transportation, Traffic, and Park-
ing, of the Draft EIR for significant cumulative impacts. UCSD is
committed to implementing feasible mitigation measures identified in
the Draft EIR if the 2004 LRDP is adopted. A mitigation monitoring
and reporting program will also be adopted at the time of project
approval to ensure implementation of the mitigation measures.

3) As discussed in mitigation measures Tra-1C in the Draft EIR, UCSD
will continue to implement its alternative transportation program,
which includes the shuttle system, expanding upon it where feasible.
Refer to Response O7-1 regarding addressing the concerns of the
community.

4) Refer to #4 of Response O21-3.

5) Refer to #5 of Response O21-3.

6) Refer to #6 of Response O21-3.

7) Refer to #7 of Response O21-3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Reevaluate off-site mitigation for the six intersections listed in Table 4.13-14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Form a joint partnership with the City, the UCPG, SANDAG, and private enterprise to actively and creatively address transit issues in the University City area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Jointly apply with the UCPG for research grant/demonstration project status for a UCSD project based on the California Fuel Cell Initiative - Smart Transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Address fiscal issues and search for funding from private donations as well as provide “in-kind” technical services through the Jacobs School of Engineering and other relevant schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sincerely,
For the UCPG Executive Committee,

Stanley E. Siegel
Chair, University Community Planning Group
O38-1 This comment letter is the same as an earlier comment letter (Letter O21). Refer to Responses O21-1 and 37-1.

WHEREAS, the University Community Plan provides a balance of planning policy elements including residential, (including a high density urban node), commercial and industrial development, open space and recreation, supported by a careful analysis of the vehicular traffic and availability of mass transit, and

WHEREAS, it was anticipated that allowable development would proceed within the community at a pace supported by the transportation infrastructure and proposed transit improvements, and

WHEREAS, within Table 2-2 Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures of the UCSD LRDP EIR there are two issues that are identified as significant and unmitigatable. These being:

4.9 Noise and pollution exceeding current community standards in the City of San Diego
4.13 Transportation, Traffic, and Parking – Regional decreases in traffic level of service. And

WHEREAS the urban node is situated South of Eastgate Mall and north of Nobel Drive, and clustered along the east-west thoroughfares of La Jolla Village Drive and Nobel Drive, between the UCSD campus and I-805, and

WHEREAS, UCSD is not in the position to implement off-site mitigation and

WHEREAS, UCSD does not contribute to the North University City Facilities Benefit Assessment (FBA) account, but benefits directly from the expenditures of money from (FBA) account, UCSD should make it a top priority to provide valuable in-kind design/technical services to solve the issues raised.

WHEREAS, San Diego City Council Policy 600-34 mandates that transit facilities and services be an integral part of the planning/community plan process, and that all appropriate planning, right-of-way protection and acquisition, funding of transit facilities construction, operation and maintenance, and inter-jurisdiction coordination actions be taken to facilitate transit development and
COMMENTS

WHEREAS, according to Council Policy 600-34, effective May 20, 1986, “Section 3 - Funding of Transit Construction Facilities, Operation and Maintenance. A. Whether acting on its own or in concert with MTDB and/or other agencies, the City shall aggressively pursue all available opportunities for federal and state transit funding assistance. And B. Council-approved transit alignments and stations shall be incorporated into community public facilities financing plans (FBA). Where appropriate, the City shall utilize development agreements, development fees, and/or ordinances to allow for in-lieu fees, special assessment districts, air rights leasing, and other such mechanisms to obtain transit funding.”

California Government Code, Section 61600-61601.28 gives community financing benefit area's broad jurisdiction and powers to implement transportation services/facilities that are feasible, economically sound and in the public interest, and

WHEREAS, transit alignments and facilities have not previously been incorporated into the North University City Facilities Benefit Assessment (FBA) program and FBA funding has not been provided for such facilities, resulting in shortfalls in funding for project implementation, and

WHEREAS, the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) of UCSD anticipates an increase in student, faculty, and support population, with anticipated significant additional demands/impacts on commuter traffic, use of single occupancy vehicles on local streets and regional interstates, and a greater need for mass transit. One or more of the following means should be considered to improve or increase transit capability, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Light Rail Transit (LRT), Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), hydrogen shuttle buses, Super loop, Coaster station at Nobel Drive between Towne Centre Drive and Shoreline Drive, local shuttle, High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes on the interstates, and planned improvements at intersections, turn lanes, highway interchanges, interstate access, and improvements on I - 5 and I - 805, and

WHEREAS, new, unrelated development is also planned in the North University Sub area in compliance with the Community Plan, and additional proposals for Community Plan amendments are under consideration by the local planning group which anticipate increases in Average Daily Trips (ADT’s), and, the Greater University Community Area is becoming an increasingly greater employment destination,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the proposed EIR review of the UCSD Long Range Development Plan consider the phasing of the anticipated population growth and planned increase in habitable square footage monitored under CEQA guidelines and required mitigation to lessen cumulative and direct impacts, and off-street parking for single rider and low occupancy vehicles with the planned but not yet operational components of the transportation infrastructure including joint operating agreements with non-UCSD authorities designed to increase capacity/storage

RESPONSES

O38-2 Refer to Response O21-2.
O38-2 (cont.)

facilities for the existing UCSD shuttle program, including but not limited to the BRT, LRT, ITS, Super Loop Shuttle, expanded bus transit center at Westfield UTC, the reconfigured interchange at La Jolla Village Drive/1-805, and UCPG recommends that important transit improvements be made prior to densification of LRDP. Transportation improvements and public transit should be coordinated with and precede the proposed development and planned densification on the UCSD campus and the anticipated increase in utilization of single occupancy vehicles, increased commuter traffic, and increased need for off-street parking on campus and park-and-ride lots off campus.

FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED, that in light of the fact that the implementation of the 2004 LRDP would cause an increase in traffic that is substantial and have direct/cumulative impacts that would also exceed level of service standards, BE IT RESOLVED that UCSD needs to:

1. Commit to solving the problem; address it as a major problem.
2. Refine, define in scope and commit to implementation and controlled measures to mitigate and monitor cumulative impacts.
3. Maintain and increase capacity of shuttle system.
4. Reevaluate off-site mitigation for 6 intersections listed in Table 4.13-14.
5. Form a joint partnership – UCSD, the City, UCPG, SANDAG, and private enterprise to actively and creatively address transit issues in the University City area.
6. Jointly apply with UCPG for research grant/demonstration project status for a UCSD project based on California Fuel Cell Initiative – Smart Transit.
7. Address fiscal issues - search for funding, UCPG’s FBA, private donations as well as provide ‘in-kind’ technical services through the Jacobs School of Engineering and other relevant schools.

*Note: Please see attachments –
1. City of San Diego, CA Council Policy 600-34; effective May 20, 1986
2. University Community Plan, San Diego, CA, III. Goals - page 142; Adopted by the City Council on January 16, 1990
4. California Codes, Government Code Section 61600-61602

Respectfully Submitted,

Linda Nelson Colley
3589 Syracuse Avenue
San Diego, CA 92122

Charles Herzfeld
5832 Stresemann Street
San Diego, CA 92122
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CITY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

COUNCIL POLICY

SUBJECT: TRANSIT PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

POLICY NO.: 600-34

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 20, 1986

BACKGROUND:

Public transit must inevitably play an increasingly important role in San Diego’s total transportation system. Consequently, it is imperative that a strengthened “transit consciousness” be fostered on the part of local public planners, administrators, and elected officials, as well as the general public. Further, it is vital that the financing and development of future needed public transit facilities and services be accelerated to the extent that this can reasonably be accomplished.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this policy is to convey the high priority that the Council attaches to facilitating the growth and development of public transit in the San Diego area; and to indicate some of the measures and mechanisms that will be employed, in cooperation with the Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB), to achieve the protection and acquisition of transit rights-of-way and funding of local transit’s capital, operating, and maintenance costs.

POLICY:

It shall be the policy of the Council to work closely with MTDB in planning for, and implementing the development of, public transit in the San Diego area. More specifically, the City shall pursue implementing measures (as listed below) in the areas of planning; right-of-way protection and acquisition; and the funding of guideway and facility construction, operation, and maintenance.

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. Planning
   A. The Planning Department shall regard transit as an integral component of all major planning studies and programs.
   B. Existing and proposed transit corridors, including fixed guideways, shall be clearly depicted on the General Plan’s land use, transportation, and urban design elements and maps. Land use and development intensity recommendations shall be incorporated into the General Plan to reinforce the use and effectiveness of these identified transit corridors.
   C. Transit opportunities shall be thoroughly studied and evaluated in the preparation of all community plans. Recommendations for transit routes and stations shall be identified in all community plans. Land use proposals and transit recommendations shall be complementary to each other, as well as to the surrounding community scale.
   D. The locations of existing and proposed transit stations and transit centers shall be shown on all plan maps, as appropriate.
2. Right-of-Way Protection and Acquisition

A. The authority contained in State Government Code Section 66475.2 and Municipal Code Section 102.0405 shall be utilized in the processing of new subdivisions and resubdivisions to obtain transit reservations and/or dedications.

B. Where identified by Council-approved plans or other Council actions, reservations and/or dedications of needed transit rights-of-way shall be sought in conjunction with development permit application reviews.

C. Reservations and/or dedications of needed transit rights-of-way shall be provided for as part of development agreements, as required by the applicable community plans and specific Council actions.

D. Encroachment permit applications shall be carefully reviewed to preclude installations of permanent-type improvements within future transit rights-of-way, as previously determined by Council.

3. Funding of Transit Construction Facilities, Operation and Maintenance

A. Whether acting on its own or in concert with MTD and/or other agencies, the City shall aggressively pursue all available opportunities for federal and state transit funding assistance.

B. Council-approved transit alignments and stations shall be incorporated into community public facilities financing plans. Where appropriate, the City shall utilize development agreements, development fees, and/or ordinances to allow for in-lieu fees, special assessment districts, air-rights leasing, and other such mechanisms to obtain transit funding.

C. Appropriate levels of transit improvement financing shall be incorporated in all Facilities Benefit Assessment (F.B.A.) programs based on Council-approved community plans.

D. MTD shall be encouraged to maximize transit operating efficiency, and to maintain a reasonably high farebox recovery rate in order to minimize the need for other sources of funding.

E. Legislative proposals at all levels of government that will provide increased funds on an equitable basis for local transit construction and/or operation shall be strongly supported.

4. Coordination with other Jurisdictions

Where transit routes have been identified by other agencies or jurisdictions, they should be considered for incorporation into the appropriate City plan document.

HISTORY:

Adopted by Resolution R-265759 05/20/1986
2. Pedestrian Facilities. Pedestrian facilities in the University Community have been provided as a condition of the approvals of many development projects. These facilities include sidewalks constructed in conjunction with City streets, interior private walkways included in planned commercial developments and planned residential developments, and special facilities such as the pedestrian overpasses which have been constructed over La Jolla Village Drive near Villa La Jolla and from University Towne Center to the Plaza, and over Genesee Avenue from the Plaza to Regents Park. Approved, but not constructed pedestrian overpasses include facilities over Genesee Avenue from University Towne Centre to Costa Verde, and over La Jolla Village Drive from University Towne Centre to Embassy Suites and from Regents Park to Costa Verde. These pedestrian overpasses are discussed more specifically in the Urban Design Element.

III. GOALS

A. Provide a network of transportation systems that are integrated, complementary and compatible with other City-wide and regional goals. The network should take into account the physical, social, economic and environmental conditions of the community, both present and future.

B. Provide a balanced public transportation system to link the entire community to all of its own activity areas and to the San Diego metropolitan area as a whole.

C. Encourage alternative modes of transportation by requiring developer participation in transit facility improvements, the Intra-Community Shuttle Loop and the Light Rail Transit Line.

D. Ensure implementation of Council Policy 600-34, Transit Planning and Development.

IV. PROPOSALS

A. STREETS AND HIGHWAYS

1. Street Network. The existing street system should be maintained and operational improvements made, based on proven need, to increase efficiency and accommodate planned growth. Projected traffic volumes and the
University Community Plan

In August of 1958, the city Planning Commission, endorsed by the City Council directed the Planning Department of the City of San Diego to "prepare a new Master Plan for the areas adjacent to the proposed La Jolla site of the University of California, including a compatible land use plan and local highway system to adequately serve the proposed University and its environs." This plan was presented for adoption in 1959 with the understanding that the plan confirmed that "the area adjacent to the proposed site for the Campus could fully satisfy the requirements for the development of a compatible community and local highway system for the service and convenience of a major campus." The city believed that the new Master Plan would "make possible the development of a University Community which will not only fulfill all requirements specified by the University of California, but also be an asset to the City of San Diego as a whole and a landmark to which its citizens may point with justifiable pride."

The University Community Plan identifies community transportation goals for the University community planning area. The transportation goals relevant to the 2004 LRDP are identified below.

- Develop a transportation system designed to move people and goods safely and efficiently within the community, including linkages with other communities, and with due consideration for energy conservation;
- Encourage the adequate provision of public transit between major activity areas such as UCSD, University Towne Centre, and La Jolla Village Square;
- To provide pedestrian paths and bikeways to accommodate the community and complement the Citywide systems;
- Encourage alternative modes of transportation by requiring developer participation in transit facility improvements, the intra-community shuttle loop, and the light rail transit system; and
- To ensure implementation of the City Council Policy 600-34, Transit Planning and Development.

The traffic analysis prepared for the 1987 University Community Plan EIR relied upon the City's 1986 traffic projections for the area. In that analysis, the City allowed up to 110,000 average daily trips (ADT) for UCSD at horizon year 2005. That same base of data also supported the development of the Facilities Benefit Assessment (FBA) plan in 1985, a set of roadway projects to improve the flow of traffic (the FBA is discussed in more detail later in this section). Subsequent to this analysis, the City revised the Community Plan in 2000 to include several amendments that had occurred since 1987. This revision did not change the baseline assumptions for UCSD trips in the 1987 plan and related EIR (i.e., 110,000 ADT for UCSD cited in the plan's updated land use intensity table).

UCSD's proposed 2004 LRDP is consistent with the City's Community Plan traffic assumptions in that the current projected ADT for the campus is less than 110,000 at horizon year 2020 on the local roadway network.
61500. A district formed under this law may exercise the powers granted for any of the following purposes designated in the petition for formation of the district and for any other of the following purposes that the district shall adopt:

(a) To supply the inhabitants of the district with water for domestic use, irrigation, sanitation, industrial use, fire protection, and recreation.
(b) The collection, treatment, or disposal of sewage, waste, and storm water of the district and its inhabitants.
(c) The collection or disposal of garbage or refuse matter.
(d) Protection against fire.
(e) Public recreation including, but not limited to, aquatic parks and recreational harbors, equestrian trails, playgrounds, golf courses, swimming pools, or recreational buildings.
(f) Street lighting.
(g) Mosquito abatement.
(h) The equipment and maintenance of a police department, other police protection, or other security services to protect and safeguard life and property.
(i) To acquire sites for, construct, and maintain library buildings, and to cooperate with other governmental agencies for library service.
(j) The constructing, opening, widening, extending, straightening, surfacing, and maintaining, in whole or in part, of any street in the district, subject to the consent of the governing body of the county or city in which the improvement is to be made.
(k) The construction and improvement of bridges, culverts, curbs, gutters, drains, and works incidental to the purposes specified in subdivision (j), subject to the consent of the governing body of the county or city in which the improvement is to be made.
(l) The conversion of existing overhead electric and communication facilities to underground locations, which facilities are owned and operated by either a "public agency" or a "public utility," as defined in Section 5996.2 of the Streets and Highways Code, and to take proceedings for and to finance the cost of the conversion in accordance with Chapter 28 (commencing with Section 5996.1) of Part 3 of Division 1 of the Streets and Highways Code, subject to the consent of the public agency or public utility responsible for the owning, operation, and maintenance of the facilities. Nothing in this section gives a district formed under this law the power to install, own, or operate the facilities that are described in this subdivision.
(m) To contract for ambulance service to serve the residents of the district as convenience requires, if a majority of the voters in the district, voting in an election thereon, approve.
(n) To provide and maintain public airports and landing places for aerial traffic.
(o) To provide transportation services.
(p) To maintain streets and public works.
(q) To construct, maintain, and operate flood protection works and facilities, subject to the following conditions:
(i) The planning, design, construction, maintenance, and operation of flood protection works and facilities, or substantially similar
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(d) Adopt and enforce by ordinance water conservation measures to the extent that the ordinance is not less restrictive than a similar ordinance adopted by the county.

(e) Acquire, own, maintain, and operate land for wildlife habitat mitigation or other environmental protection or mitigation within or without the district.

(f) To provide facilities for television and telecommunications systems including the installation of wires, cables, conduits, fiber optic lines, terminal panels, service space, and appurtenances required to provide television, telecommunications, and data transfer services to the district and its inhabitants, and provide facilities for a cable television system, including the installation of wires, cables, conduits, and appurtenances to serve the district and its inhabitants by franchise or license; provided, however, that the district may not provide or install any facilities under this subdivision unless one or more cable franchises or licenses have been awarded under Section 53066 and the franchised or licensed cable television and telecommunications services providers are permitted equal access to the utility trenches, conduits, service spaces, easements, utility poles, and rights-of-way in the district necessary to construct their facilities concurrently with the construction of the district's facilities. The district shall not have the authority to operate television, cable, or telecommunications systems. The district shall have the same powers as a city or county under Section 53066 in granting a franchise or license for the operation of a cable television system.

(g) Provide and maintain equipment, tools, and administrative facilities, including, but not limited to, shops, storage areas, and maintenance yards.

(h) Disseminate information to the public concerning activities and actions within the district.

(i) Acquire, own, maintain, and operate land for disposal of sewage effluent by irrigation or otherwise within or outside of the district, subject to all applicable state and federal laws, except within the area described in Section 29720 of the Public Resources Code.

(j) Acquire, own, maintain, and operate land for disposal of sludge created by a water treatment plant and sewage treatment plant within or outside of the district, subject to all applicable state and federal laws, except within the area described in Section 29720 of the Public Resources Code.

61601.27. Formation of the Mountain House Community Services District, and any powers that may be exercised by the district, shall be subject to approval by the local agency formation commission for San Joaquin County in accordance with the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (Division 3 (commencing with Section 56000) of Title 5), following the submittal of a resolution of application.

61601.28. In addition to the powers which may be exercised pursuant to Section 61600 and after approval by the local agency formation commission for Ventura County in accordance with the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000 (Division 3 (commencing with Section 56000) of Title 5), whenever the board of directors of the Ahmanson Ranch Community Services District
determines by resolution, entered into the minutes, that it is feasible, economically sound, and in the public interest, the board of directors may adopt by resolution and thereafter the powers of the district may be exercised for the purposes of: coordinating affordable housing programs; maintaining and repairing bicycle and multipurpose trails; slope maintenance on slopes adjacent to public or private rights-of-way; the maintenance, operation, and capital replacement of community facilities including, but not limited to, government buildings such as a town hall and a community maintenance facility that provides capabilities for servicing the equipment used to maintain public areas; maintaining community entry and monument lighting; installing or planting and maintaining landscaping within public street rights-of-way or covenants within the district; modifying wildfire fuel on publicly owned lands; providing library services; and providing transportation programs, including school busing.

61601.30. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of Sections 61600 and 61601 and subject to subdivisions (b), (c), and (d), whenever the Board of Directors of the Wallace Community Services District determines by resolution that it is feasible, economically sound, and in the public interest for the district to exercise its power for the purpose of maintaining, controlling, or operating works or facilities within the district for supplying the district and its inhabitants with liquefied petroleum gas, the board shall adopt the additional purpose by resolution entered in the minutes and that power of the district may be exercised thereafter. The board may thereafter vest the district of the power to carry on those activities in the same manner as it may acquire that power.

(b) Except as provided in subdivision (c), regarding any privately owned works or facilities, the district shall not maintain, control, or operate any of the works or facilities for the storage, transmission, and delivery of the liquefied petroleum gas, except by either (1) mutual agreement between the district or the district's predecessor in interest and the owner of the works or facilities, or (2) by order of a court of competent jurisdiction based upon a failure of the owner of the works or facilities to perform its obligations under a mutual agreement between the district or the district's predecessor in interest and the owner of the works or facilities; provided, however, that the authority provided by this subdivision shall only be exercised where it is necessary to ensure the continued provision of liquefied petroleum gas to the residents of Wallace Lake Estates.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of Sections 61600 and 61601, the Wallace Community Services District shall have the authority to acquire, own, maintain, control, or operate the underground gas distribution pipeline system located and to be located within Wallace Lake Estates for the purpose of allowing a privately owned provider of liquefied petroleum gas to use the underground gas distribution pipeline system pursuant to a mutual agreement between the private provider of liquefied petroleum gas and the district or the district's predecessor in interest. The district shall require and receive payment from the private provider of liquefied petroleum gas for the use of the works or facilities, including the underground gas distribution pipeline system.

(d) The authority granted by this section shall expire when the Pacific Gas and Electric Company is ready, willing, and able to provide natural gas service to the residents of Wallace Lake Estates, and at that time, the district shall diligently transfer any and all
the conveyance of hydroelectric power, the board shall adopt that additional purpose by resolution entered in the minutes, and that power of the district may be exercised thereafter.

The board may, thereafter, divest the district of the power to carry on those activities in the same manner as it may acquire the power.

(b) A community services district shall not acquire property that is utilized to generate hydroelectric power for public utility purposes at the time the district adopts the resolution described in subdivision (a), unless the owner of that property agrees to the acquisition of that property by the district.

(c) The facilities shall be operated in a manner consistent with the district's storage, transmission, and distribution of domestic and irrigation water and in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 2.95 (commencing with Section 35500) of Part 3 of Division 13 of the Water Code.

61601.4. (a) Notwithstanding Section 61600 or Section 20681 of the Public Contract Code, the Board of Directors of the Big Bear City Community Services District may determine by resolution that it is feasible, economically sound, and in the public interest for the district to enter into a joint exercise of powers agreement pursuant to Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 6500) of Division 7 of Title 1 with the City of Big Bear Lake or the County of San Bernardino, or both, for the acquisition, operation, and maintenance of the electric distribution system which presently serves the district or for the construction and replacement of, or for additions or improvements to, this system.

(b) The board may adopt this additional purpose by resolution entered in the minutes of a meeting of the board, and thereafter the district may exercise these powers. The district may exercise no power over any other electric distribution system, and may only exercise these powers through a joint exercise of powers agreement.

61601.5. Notwithstanding the provisions of Sections 61600 and 61601, whenever the Board of Directors of the Dublin-San Ramon Services District determines by resolution that it is feasible, economically sound, and in the public interest for the district to exercise its power for the purpose of conducting studies of the transportation needs of such district, the board shall adopt such additional purpose by resolution entered in the minutes, and the powers of such district may be exercised therefor. Such board may thereafter divest itself of the power to conduct transportation studies in the same manner as it may acquire such power.

61601.6. Notwithstanding the provisions of Sections 61600 and 61601, whenever the Board of Directors of the Baker Community Services District determines by resolution that it is feasible, economically sound, and in the public interest for the district to exercise its power for the purpose of constructing, improving, maintaining, and operating television translator facilities and related services, or for the purpose of providing, maintaining, operating, and contracting for emergency medical health care facilities and services, the board shall adopt such additional
July 22, 2004

Catherine Presmyk, Assistant Director, Environmental Planning
University of California, San Diego
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA 92039-0993

RE: 2004 UCSD LRDP EIR - July 16, 2004 response from Catherine Presmyk,
UCSD Campus Planner, to La Jolla Community Planning Association’s letter dated July 7, 2004.

Dear Ms. Presmyk:

The UCSD letter to the La Jolla Community Planning Association (LJCPA) dated July 16, 2004 is non-responsive to our letter dated July 7, 2004 requesting:

- Receipt of a comprehensive list of unmet mitigations from the 1989 UCSD LRDP prepared by UCSD and distributed for review to the CPA, community groups and residents.
- Extension of the deadline for comments on the EIR for the 2004 UCSD LRDP of at least one month following receipt of the list of unmet mitigations for the 1989 UCSD LRDP.
- Summary of UCSD meetings with City Representatives about off-campus mitigations held over the past fifteen years.

O39-1 UCSD believes that it has adequately responded to the commentor’s request.
O39-2 UCSD’s July 16, 2004, response letter is included in Attachment 1 and the attachment to the letter is provided in Attachment 2. Mitigation measures from the 1989 EIR and their implementation status are listed in the table provided in the attachment to the letter, public review was extended, and city meetings were addressed in UCSD’s cover letter. UCSD has been responsive to the requests in both comment letters from LJCPA and is not clear what additional information the commentor is seeking.
O39-3 Refer to Response O39-1.

O39-2 Pursuant to Public Resource Code Section 15209, UCSD has provided adequate time for members of the public to review and comment on the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR. Furthermore, Section 15105(a) of the CEQA Guidelines state that, “The public review period for a draft EIR shall not be less than 30 days nor should it be longer than 60 days except under unusual circumstances.” The focus of public review was to assess the content of the 2004 LRDP EIR for which ample time was allotted. Therefore, the extension was appropriate and exceeded CEQA requirements.

O39-3 Our letter further included a request for an “Extension of the deadline for comments on the EIR for the 2004 UCSD LRDP of at least one month following receipt of the list of unmet mitigations for the 1989 UCSD LRDP”. The arbitrary choice of July 23, 2004 as the extension of the EIR public review comment period, coupled with the lack of adequate response to the request for information (defined in the 1989 LRDP EIR as being “available to the public upon request”; 1989 LRDP p. 122, and Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 noted on page 2 of our letter dated July 7, 2004) compromises the EIR process and places the LJCPA in an untenable position.
It should be noted that in a phone conversation with Milt Phegley on July 16, 2004 he stated that any comments received after July 23, 2004 would be responded to by the University, but would not be included in the public record for the 2004 UCSD LRDP EIR. At that time, Mary Coakley, secretary of the LJCPA, told him that the proposed extension of the deadline was not only inadequate, but extremely unreasonable. The LJCPA does not meet until August 5, 2004 and LJCPA Chair Simon Andrews, several Trustees and many members concerned with long range planning in La Jolla are currently out of town. Their input is critical to a thorough and comprehensive response. Thus we anticipate your cooperation in providing an extension of the deadline for public comment in the public record of the EIR until one month following the date of receipt of the aforementioned information.

Finally, your letter provides an acknowledgement of UCSD’s meetings with City of San Diego staff to discuss off-campus mitigations. While communication with numerous local agencies regarding various off-campus issues may have occurred on an ongoing basis over the duration of the 1989 LRDP, in many cases it has not resulted in the effective implementation of necessary off-campus mitigation measures in La Jolla. It is important that the community understand residual CEQA compliance issues from the 1989 UCSD LRDP EIR, before determining the credibility of proposed mitigations, or the lack thereof, for the 2004 UCSD LRDP EIR.

A preliminary response to the Summary of Implementation of 1989 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures has been prepared by the LJCPA UCSD Ad Hoc Committee and is attached below for inclusion in public comment to the 2004 UCSD LRDP EIR. (Due to obvious time constraints, it is incomplete and has not yet been ratified by a vote of the Trustees.)

We are sincerely interested in working with you to preserve and to advance the quality of our community. We look forward to a prompt response.

Sincerely,
Simon Andrews, LJCPA Chair
Mary Coakley, LJCPA Secretary
P.O. Box 889
La Jolla, CA 92037
(619) 840-0250
coaileyms@san.rr.com

CC: Martha Chandler, Acting Chancellor, UCSD
Marye Ann Fox, Chancellor Designate, UCSD
Robert Dynes, President, University of California
Board of Regents, University of California
Stan Siegel, UCPG Chair
Mayor Dick Murphy
Councilmember Scott Peters
Steven W. Relyea, UCSD Vice Chancellor, Business Affairs
Jeffrey A. Steindorf, UCSD Assistant Vice Chancellor Campus Planning
James M. Langley, UCSD Vice Chancellor External Relations
Milt Phegley, UCSD Planning

The 2004 LRDP and LRDP EIR are scheduled to be considered, along with all comments and responses, by The Regents at the September 2004 Regents meeting. Refer to Response O39-3.

Refer to Response O39-1.

The commentor’s responses are comments on a document pertaining to the 1989 LRDP EIR, not the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR. UCSD provided the information in order to be helpful and responsive to the community and UCSD believes the information provided responded to the request. Because the comments are not on the current document, it would not be appropriate to respond further in this document. However, many of the issues raised have been responded to in previous responses to other comment letters (see responses to Comment Letters O17 and O25).
COMMENTS

*** Preliminary response by members of LJCPA UCSD LRDP Ad Hoc Committee to the Summary of Implementation of 1989 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

p. 10, Sec. 3.12.2 Key view shed area, corridors both east and west from Ridge Walk. It appears that extensive development along Ridge Walk since 1989 combined with proposed development in the 2004 LRDP EIR threaten views both to the mountains and to the ocean. Ridge Walk is a unique location providing views to both simultaneously. Please provide map reference for view corridors.

p. 11 Sec. 3.2.3.4 Land Use and Housing: In the Measure Description, the first sentence is not a sentence and does not seem to make sense. It mentions a target of 50% campus housing. It would appear that even in the new plan chances of that are scant in spite of the negative impacts on traffic, transportation, parking, air quality, land use, etc. without that mitigation.

It would seem that the only reason no significant adverse impacts are anticipated to regional housing supply is that students continue to live further and further away because of the hourglass access to UCSD, due to its east-west constrictions between low population areas, like the Pacific Ocean, and the Miramar Marine Base and the City Dump, causing housing to be attenuated, thus increasing problems of air quality, traffic, parking, transportation, safety, etc. for people living near UCSD in University City and La Jolla.

It may be that there are additional serious, undocumented, adverse consequences re: the lack of provision for on-campus student housing. If UCSD students and faculty and staff are renting close to UCSD in spite of the awfully high rents, then the availability of "affordable" housing for workers in the community (i.e., those who would then not have to drive in from the periphery) is adversely affected. UCSD and the City should be forced to provide a detailed analysis of housing trends in the area considered proximate to the University. Blanket statements are not acceptable!

p. 12, Sec. 3.1.4.1(a) Land Use: Estimated parking spaces appear to be 25,230. What are the actual campus population numbers, including students, staff, faculty, industrial-commercial complexes, hospital visitors, theatre goers, library patrons, and the many (how many) visitors to UCSD campus? What percentage of parking does UCSD actually provide for these uses and users? Future percentages of parking provided for projected users for projected uses?

Without actual numbers in this mitigation document, UCSD is failing to provide any sense of a traffic and parking study. For example, are there Visitor spots to accommodate the visitors? If so, how many? i.e., hard numbers, not percentages only, would be helpful. With respect to parking - what impact on air quality and noise levels is ACTUALLY occurring on a daily basis in the neighborhoods around UCSD as a consequence of parking problems? What impact to noise and air quality of the area around La Jolla Village Square of same issues?

p. 13-14, Sec 3.2.2.1(a) Traffic: Mitigations (h) and (k) would help deal with impacts of UCSD traffic in La Jolla yet neither has been implemented. (h) La Jolla Village Drive –
COMMENTS

Torrey Pines has increased use, complicated the intersection with double turning lanes, increasing danger to pedestrians crossing at that intersection, and does not provide the suggested mitigation of tunneling. In addition, a proposed project on Site 653 further complicates the situation and negates mitigation attempts. (k) has, according to this report, been deleted from the EIR. Thus both mitigations have been removed and nothing added to replace it. As La Jolla public transit is weak to put it mildly, with no alternatives in sight, and as the north university City shuttle was scuttled, what is UCSD going to mitigate the increasing traffic on the west side of the campus? These omissions constitute an unmet environmental mitigation in this area.

C.f.: concluding comments re: the necessity of attorney opinions on the mitigation mischief.

p. 15, Sec 3.5.2.1 and 3.5.3.1 Utilities: How much of UCSD landscape irrigation and outdoor water use actually uses recycled water? What percentage? How many gallons total?

p. 16-17 Sec. 3.6.2.2(a)and (b) Community Services: According to San Diego Police, possible impacts of proximity to UCSD include increased drug deals within the neighborhood, already evidenced by cars with drivers on cell phones meeting mid-street in the residential neighborhood south of the campus and exchanging brown paper bags that did not look like bagged lunches! Also San Diego Police report an increase of drug use issues at La Jolla Village Square and east, possibly due to the fact that foreign students may not know applicable drug laws. Mitigation states that the San Diego Police should add new levels of service for UCSD-impacted community services. Who pays for those services? What increases in service have been demonstrated for the UC-La Jolla area?

We need the documents from the City (including budget provisions) to show that the police and emergency services mitigations from 1989 have been met. Further, we need to know what cost to the taxpayer these mitigations have incurred or what drain on services that would otherwise be available to rest of San Diego?

p. 17-18 Sec. 3.1.3.5(b) Land use – parking and 3.2.2.3
1. Question: report states that from 1991-2004, alternative transportation ridership increased by 49%. What is the actual number of riders? How does that compare to the increase in staff, faculty, students, and visitors in that period?
2. Reports in this section and further on vary about the vans: apparently a van fleet of 13 (sec.3.4.2.3(a), p. 20) but up to 29 van pools? How does that work?
3. Question: report states that alternative transportation is funded primarily by parking fees. Why? Why don’t users pay? Funding alternate transportation places an undue pressure on parking fees which raises the fees, resulting in more staff, students, and faculty parking in the residential neighborhoods to avoid excessive parking fees. Why should residents bear the brunt of this inadequate system?
4. Report states that various mitigations planned, but “North University (City) shuttle was never implemented”, no new bike paths on campus since 1989, SANDAG responsible for trolley – but it was not implemented – so mitigation did not occur – so numbers of UCSD staff, faculty, students, and buildings should not be increased until these mitigations occur. UNMET MITIGATIONS MEAN NO EXPANSION SHOULD BE PERMITTED.

RESPONSES
COMMENTS

There is a concern that the main reason the UCSD LRT system was not developed was in response to internal UCSD faculty who objected to it. UCSD needs to provide the annual mitigation reports to explain *WHY* the LRT was not provided.

p. 21 Sec. 3.4.2.3(b) Air quality states suggested mitigation of housing 50% of students on campus, but that is not happening currently nor in future planning. This constitutes an unmet mitigation.

1. Question: How many students are currently housed on campus? How many are currently housed off campus? What percentage will be housed on campus with proposed increase in population of 5200 students? Sue - I think the whole 50% is bogus and allows UCSD to slide around too many calculations.

p. 22 Sec. 3.6.2.3 Solid Waste states that UCSD has reduced solid waste to landfill by 3500 tons. How many tons does it currently add to landfill? What percentage then is the 3500 ton reduction?

p. 23 Sec. 3.7.3.1(b) Geology/Soils/ Topography: While UCSD dismisses steep slope development cursorily, it must be noted that at the south edge of the campus, abutting La Jolla Village Drive, UCSD is building above steep slopes with so little setback that the net effect for drivers on La Jolla Village Drive is an “acropolis effect” where UCSD looms above the neighboring roadways and neighborhoods. The proposed building of the Hillel of UCSD facility (currently so-named in city and architectural documents) will only exacerbate that effect. UCSD needs to allocate some space for its off-campus agglomerates and keep university-affiliated uses out of residential-zoned areas, homes, and actively protest the usurping of public open space parks for its student institutional developments.

In conclusion, it appears that UCSD has a considerable way to go in meeting the 1989 LRDP mitigations and should be prevented from launching a new LRDP until mitigation questions pertaining to the 1989 plan are answered and the mitigation requirements met.

Further, we request that the City of San Diego government be required to provide all records of meetings with UCSD planners; it should also provide a detailed analysis of ALL of the mitigations undertaken by the City for UCSD’s 1989 LRDP. Further, there should be a statement from the City Attorney of the current legal standing of the UCSD LRDP in relation to UCSD’s, the City’s and SANDAG’s responsibilities per the 1989 UCSD LRDP EIR.

Further, a detailed list of all unmet/partially met/ignored mitigations of UCSD, the City and SANDAG should be provided ALONG WITH legal opinion from UCSD, the City Attorney, and the SANDAG attorney as to the CEQA compliance OR NOT of all of the responses. There are probably a lot of other agencies whose attorneys should be providing opinion for mitigations met/unmet/ignored.

CEQA concerns are paramount. With respect to UCSD’s determination that they cannot provide alternative locations (the CEQA clause), what about the alternative sites for ALL of the private companies now moving on to campus? If the regular undergraduate and
graduate teaching has to be performed on this site, so be it, but why all of the other development?

Finally, the La Jolla Community Planning Association AGAIN respectfully requires that the documentation requested above be provided by UCSD and by the City of San Diego concerning unmet mitigations both on-campus off-campus so that the success OR NOT of the mitigation requirements of the 1989 LRDP EIR can be ascertained before any new LRDP is considered.

We ask that the documentation be provided as soon as possible and that the deadline. Further, because our organization functions on a monthly cycle, we request that the deadline for public comment on the EIR be extended for one month AFTER the receipt of all documentation requested.

Respectfully submitted by Members of the UCSD LRDP Ad Hoc Committee
La Jolla Community Planning Association
 COMMENTS

CARMEN LUCAS
P.O. Box 44
Julian, California 92036

17 July 2004

Jeffrey A. Steindorf
UCSD Assistant Vice Chancellor Campus Planning
9500 Gilman Drive, M.C. 0006
San Diego, Ca. 92093-0006

Ref: (a) Courtney Ann Coyle Attorney At Law, Letter dated July 9, 2004; Ref:
Draft UCSD 2004 Long Range Development Plan
(b) San Diego Archaeological Center letter dated June 18, 2004

Dear Mr. Steindorf:

Reference (a) advised that I might provide additional comments once I had an opportunity to review the DEIR and the comments therein. Reference (b) addresses the Curation aspect to Archaeological testing. Please be advised I concur with the practice of appropriate Curation of Archaeological artifacts acquired as a result of archaeological testing. I would also request that UCSD participate in Curation.

Additionally I have reviewed the subject DEIR. 4.4.1.3 Archaeological Resources as it address the Archival Records search of archaeological site maps, etcetera with the last paragraph stating that:

"At this time, no prehistoric archaeological resources located on campus have been identified as significant sites by the Native American Community. However, given the presence of burials on a number of these resources, this status could change in the future. Future work on sensitive prehistoric resources should include consultation with the local Native American Community."

In addition to the comments submitted in reference (a) about this subject, I would like to state that you don’t need the Indians to tell you that archeological sites are significant and most assuredly Human Burials are not only significant, sensitive sites but are also considered sacred. The University has spent thousands of dollars over a period of many years to have various Cultural Resource Management Companies tell you what you already know.

I would like to take this opportunity to request that your guidelines state that all future work on sensitive prehistoric resources MUST include a Native American Monitor who has knowledge of prehistory and MUST include consultation with the local Native American community.

RESPONSES

O40-1

Refer to Responses O26-1 and O15-1 through -7.

O40-2

UCSD consults with the Native American community and uses Native American monitors as appropriate. Please refer to Response O26-4.
Table 4.4-2 of the Draft EIR represents a summary of recommendations provided in the Cultural Resources Technical report. Preservation typically results in leaving a site as open space. UCSD acknowledges the commentor’s views with regard to impacts to human remains. It is because of similar views from the Native American community that the Draft EIR concluded that the 2004 LRDP could result in cumulatively considerable and potentially unavoidable contribution to significant cultural resources impacts if human remains are impacted. With regard to the commentor’s views on feasibility, the commentor is referred to the definition of feasible in Public Resource Code Section 21061.1 which states that feasibility is defined as being “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factor.” This is the standard by which mitigation measures are judged pursuant to CEQA.