a written comment before the deadline.

So with that, I'd like to first ask if there's any questions regarding procedure and process?

(No responses.)

MR. PHEGLE: Okay. Seeing none, then we will begin with the public testimony. The first speaker is Dr. Larry Fogel.

DR. FOGEL: Thank you very much. I apologize for my voice. I'm not doing very well tonight.

The ecological reserve is protected against no building, roads or driveways will be permitted in this area of the park. The Torrey Pines Gliderport has been recognized as an historic site at the city, state and federal levels at different dates. I believe that that historic site should be recognized as one of the areas of concern in the listing here. It is more than simply a recreational area; it's an historic area, and should have the same kind of protective rights in the plan going for them.

There's other small items, but they were taken care of in the commentary I'll send in. Thank you very much.

MR. PHEGLE: Thank you.

Professor Alan Schneider.

DR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

I live on Cliffridge Avenue, which is just one
The San Diego Union-Tribune article referenced by the commentor paraphrased Mr. Phegely mentioning, “the university may work with city officials to create permit-required street parking in some neighborhoods surrounding the campus.” The permit program that was mentioned is not a part of the proposed 2004 LRDP or the Draft EIR. The intent of the permit program mentioned would be to decrease the amount of UCSD related parking occurring in some surrounding neighborhoods by restricting parking availability through a City of San Diego permit program. See Response O5-1.

It is assumed that the mitigation referred to by the commentor are mitigation measures Aes-1A, Aes-1B, and Lan-2A, in the Draft EIR. Each of these mitigation measures entails a review by the UCSD Design Review Board as the first step. The Design Review Board consists of eight individuals, four of which are private sector architects selected on the basis of professional design experience. Through the design review process, specific design measures will be incorporated into the project’s design. For aesthetics, these measures include design features such as building proportion, color, and landscaping. For land use, the measures include addressing design issues such as connections to adjacent land uses, circulation, and alternative transportation facilities. In addition, as discussed in the Draft EIR, future development projects undertaken by UCSD must comply with CEQA. Therefore, the community would typically have another opportunity to comment on individual projects with potential to impact aesthetics and land use and provide input on the proposed measures specific for those projects.
Section 4.13 of the Draft EIR discusses potential impacts to traffic and transportation due to the implementation of the proposed 2004 LRDP. The analyses in this section are based on a trip distribution which accounts for residency throughout the San Diego region, based on current UCSD records of residency for students, staff, and faculty. The trip distribution also reflects the routes that these people take to access UCSD, some of which are through high-density areas (such as La Jolla Village Drive through University City) as indicated by the commentor. Additional detail on trip distribution is provided in the Traffic Analysis Report (Appendix I of the Draft EIR). UCSD project growth (and associated trips) are consistent with the University Community Plan.

Refer to Response L3-5 regarding the transportation phasing suggestion.
As indicated in Table 4-2 of the Draft EIR, SANDAG’s plans for a light rail on the UCSD campus and the Caltrans and SANDAG efforts on Interstate 5 were considered as cumulative projects during preparation of the Draft EIR. Refer to Comment Letter L2 and the corresponding responses for more discussion.

Refer to Response O25-10.
The proposed 2004 LRDP will serve as a general land use plan and policy document to guide the physical development of the campus. The Draft EIR is a Program EIR that evaluates the potential effect of the 2004 LRDP at a program level. This Program EIR addresses the proposed plan, which does not include detailed project level information of individual building projects. Project information, which was considered and is presented in the Draft EIR, includes general information of potential future land uses, the details of buildings that already exist or are already approved, and details of projects that are proposed and being processed concurrently with the proposed 2004 LRDP (the Rady School of Management, Supercomputer Center Expansion, and Hopkins Parking Structure). Furthermore, details on individual planned buildings will be made available to the public when they are considered by UCSD during subsequent project review and approval processes. Finally, UCSD's five-year state funded capital improvement program is available on the internet at http://planning.ucsd.edu/capital.shtml. Refer also to Response L2-1.
T1-8 The commentor appears to be referring to the Increased Campus Housing Alternative that is analyzed in the Draft EIR. The commentor’s interpretation of the alternative is generally correct. CEQA Guidelines state that the alternatives analysis should focus on “…alternatives capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project…” (Section 15166.6[b]). Therefore, the Increased Campus Housing Alternative focuses on addressing the impacts associated with the increase in student population that would occur from the proposed project, by suggesting the provision of housing for 100 percent of the new student population that would occur from the 2004 LRDP over existing conditions.

T1-9 In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15123, the executive summary (Chapter 2 of the EIR) provides a brief summary of the proposed actions and its consequences, including identification of each significant effect with proposed mitigation measures. Potential impacts associated with increases in staff and faculty, which could result from implementation of the proposed 2004 LRDP form the basis of the project description and are discussed throughout the Draft EIR. These analyses include consideration of the families of staff and faculty, as well as students. Families are accounted for in these analyses through the use of demand projections that are based on current numbers that include faculty, staff, students, and their families, as well as other users of the campus. For example, future demand projections for utilities and associated infrastructure such as that for water, electricity, and natural gas are based on existing usage information and the increases in square footage of campus development. Future vehicle trip generation projections are based on existing traffic numbers and are projected based on both campus population and square footage increases.
T1-10  Refer to Response 25-26. Chapter 6 of the Draft EIR discusses the possibility of an alternative location for additional campus growth. This alternative was rejected from further analysis for reasons discussed in the Draft EIR.

T1-11  The comment is directed towards dialogue between the City and UCSD, and does not specifically address issues in the EIR. Therefore, it is difficult to provide further response. The potential indirect impact of campus growth on neighboring communities from associated groups is discussed in Section 4.8 of the Draft EIR. The issue of development of off campus lands is responded to in Response O25-5.
T1-12

Refer to Response O25-39. Potential impacts to aesthetics are discussed in Section 4.1 of the Draft EIR. This section identifies that implementation of the proposed 2004 LRDP could result in significant impacts to views from adjacent land uses. Mitigation measures to reduce these impacts to a level that is less than significant are proposed and include implementation of design measures through the design review process.
T1-12 (cont.)

Unfortunately, in the La Jolla Community Plan, there is very little design information about what the University should look like on that side. That’s a serious concern for us as we look at the incredible amount of building that you’ve planned to do. It could be that we just have sort of this little mousy, mazey corridor where we once had vistas.

It’s a concern around the edge, and then I’ve already brought up the -- what do you call that walk down -- Ridge Walk -- where the Rady Management School could simply be rotated by 45 degrees, and you could have the view corridor that is currently there continue rather than have that whole V cut off from Ridge Walk, which is the one place on campus where you know that you’re right between the ocean and the mountains. It’s a terrible situation to lose. It’s such a gift.

MR. FERRIL: One more comment.

MS. BOURK: Okay. The -- actually, there are a few more that have to do with parking. I suspect that other people will bring them up. But the most important thing to me, I think, is that when Milt was at the La Jolla Shores Association, he mentioned that the transportation system to accommodate this increase was, as I understand it, going to be funded by citations for traffic violations -- on campus, I suspect, because I didn’t know of any agreement that has to do with the City in this area. Although I suspect there

T1-13

Potential impacts associated with the proposed Rady School of Management are discussed in Section 4.1 of it’s project level analysis in Volume III of the Draft EIR. Potential impacts to views from the Ridge Walk were evaluated as part of the analysis in this section. As discussed in the Draft EIR, the proposed Rady School of Management is oriented to preserve views of the ocean. These views are preserved through a corridor over a planned open space named the Wedge. Therefore, the goal of the commentor’s suggestion would be achieved. The commentor’s suggestion of rotating the project seems that it would result in visual impacts, not avoid them as the proposed project is oriented to do.

T1-14

It is unclear as to what transportation system the commentor is referring to, however, there are no known transportation systems (i.e. public transit, roads, or freeways) that are fully funded or funded in majority by citations for traffic violations. 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.
As discussed in Response L2-1, it would be inappropriate for the proposed 2004 LRDP to provide the level of detail that would include the commentor’s request. However, the 2004 LRDP does not preclude the potential for collocated/joint-use playing fields and UCSD is considering these types of projects for the future.

The Draft EIR does not contain mitigation measures that include programs to provide student parking on streets in the surrounding neighborhoods. Please refer to Response T1-2 and O5-1.
Although no specific and recent application for additional development at the Salk Institute has been submitted to the City of San Diego at the time of Draft EIR preparation, UCSD is aware that there may be some additional development on the Salk Institute property. It is UCSD’s understanding that this development would occur within the allocations for parking and square footage allowed for in the University Community Plan. In preparing the cumulative analyses for the Draft EIR, development consistent with the University Community Plan was considered. Therefore, potential cumulative impacts resulting from the development on the Salk Institute property have been accounted for.

The commentor requests cooperation to better mitigate cumulative impacts, however, the specific cumulative impacts are not identified. UCSD has and will continue to coordinate with the Salk Institute to identify potential opportunities for mutually beneficial projects and programs, however, it is not apparent that such cooperation would further reduce significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts identified in the Draft EIR. The commentor mentions day care, parking, and recreational fields or activity areas, however, there were no significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts identified in the Draft EIR for these issues.
Potential impacts to traffic are discussed in Section 4.13 of the Draft EIR. UCSD agrees that several impacts would be significant and unavoidable, as concluded in the Draft EIR. It is worth noting that the University Community Plan includes UCSD growth (traffic) and was approved years ago with significant and unavoidable traffic impacts.
Potential impacts to housing are discussed in Section 4.10 of the Draft EIR. As discussed in that section, implementation of the proposed 2004 LRDP would result in increased housing demand; however, it is not anticipated to result in significant impacts due to the displacement of people or housing.

An FBA or Facilities Benefit Assessment is a funding mechanism employed by the City of San Diego (as well as other municipalities) to collect fees from developers to fund necessary improvements in the community. An FBA is not an appropriate funding mechanism for UCSD. Furthermore, as discussed in the Draft EIR, UCSD has no flexibility to make monetary contributions to the FBA or other off campus improvements. Refer further to Response L3-5.

Potential impacts to traffic are discussed in Section 4.13 of the Draft EIR. As discussed in that section, mitigation measure Tra-1C consists of continuing to implement the alternative transportation system, with expansions where appropriate. This includes the campus’s shuttle systems, as well as coordination with SANDAG to facilitate the Super Loop and San Diego Trolley extension projects.

More precise phasing and timing of campus growth, development, and associated infrastructure demands are unknown due to the State of California budget constraints and other factors that affect UC growth. As discussed in Response L3-5, it is also not practicable to phase UCSD’s growth based on future projected infrastructure projects. With regard to funding, on-campus infrastructure improvements are funded through public and private funds that are managed through an extensive capital planning process. Funding of off-campus infrastructure improvements is managed by the agency with jurisdiction over the infrastructure and funding typically comes from a variety of sources. Funding and capital improvements projections can typically be requested from those agencies.
The proposed 2004 LRDP applies only to UCSD property. The property referred to by the commentor is not UCSD land. The use of City land by a private entity is not within the purview of the proposed 2004 LRDP. The potential indirect impact of campus growth on neighboring communities from associated groups is discussed in Section 4.8 of the Draft EIR. As discussed in that section, the use of City land by UCSD affiliated groups and organizations is under the jurisdiction of the City of San Diego. These groups and organizations, if allowed to operate within residential neighborhoods, are required to follow City ordinances including noise and nuisance requirements. Refer also to Response O25-5.
T1-24

This comment is about an existing situation that is not within the purview of the proposed 2004 LRDP or the Draft EIR. Enforcement of the City of San Diego Municipal Code and ordinances is the responsibility of the City.

T1-25

As discussed in Response T1-23, the proposed 2004 LRDP applies only to UCSD property. The City of San Diego has jurisdictional authority over land uses in the single-family residential neighborhoods surrounding the campus. The alteration of the neighboring single-family communities to mixed-use areas is extremely speculative and not indicative of any UCSD objectives. UCSD has never proposed such changes and does not propose them in the 2004 LRDP. Furthermore, if they were to be proposed by another entity, these actions would be subject to a separate review under CEQA by the City.
We're tired of stealth planning, and wish both
the City and UCSD would really tell us what's ahead so we
can do some long-range planning of our own. Thank you.

MR. PHEGLE: Thank you.

I think that does conclude speakers. Is there
anyone else who wanted to speak?

(No responses.)

MR. PHEGLE: Okay. We thank you very much for
your comments. As I indicated, we will be responding in
writing to any of these comments in the Final Environmental
Impact Report. There also may be an opportunity with some
specific questions that people have had this evening that we
can provide you information in response to your questions or
comments in a more timely manner rather than waiting for the
Final Environmental Impact Report.

As I indicated, we will be here to answer any
questions that you have after the meeting, after the close
of the hearing. Again, I thank you for participating, and
that concludes this public hearing.

(Meeting adjourned at 6:53 p.m.)
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