July 9, 2004

Mr. Robert Collins, President  
La Jolla Town Council  
PO Box 1101  
La Jolla, CA 92033

SUBJECT: 2004 UCSD Long Range Development Plan EIR

Dear Mr. Collins:

Please be advised that in response to the request contained in your letter of July 7, 2004, we will extend the EIR public review comment period for the La Jolla Town Council to July 23, 2004.

In addition, we will provide you with a) a summary of the compliance actions taken in conjunction with the mitigation commitments defined in the 1989 UCSD Long Range Development Plan EIR and b) information on UCSD meetings with City representatives in which off-campus issues have been discussed. We will provide this information no later than July 16, 2004.

It is important for us to understand your concerns about the expected growth of the campus so we may work with your organization, and others, who are interested in advancing the quality of our community.

Sincerely,

Catherine J. Presmyk  
Assistant Director,  
Environmental Planning

cc: M. Phegley
July 9, 2004

Ms. Mary Coakley, Secretary  
La Jolla Community Planning Association  
PO Box 889  
La Jolla, CA 92037  

SUBJECT: 2004 UCSD Long Range Development Plan EIR

Dear Ms. Coakley:

Please be advised that in response to the request contained in your letter of July 7, 2004, we will extend the EIR public review comment period for the La Jolla Community Planning Association to July 23, 2004.

In addition, we will provide you with a) a summary of the compliance actions taken in conjunction with the mitigation commitments defined in the 1989 UCSD Long Range Development Plan EIR and b) information on UCSD meetings with City representatives in which off-campus issues have been discussed. We will provide this information no later than July 16, 2004.

It is important for us to understand your concerns about the expected growth of the campus so we may work with your organization, and others, who are interested in advancing the quality of our community.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Catherine J. Presmyk  
Assistant Director,  
Environmental Planning

cc: M. Phegley
July 12, 2004

Isabelle Kay, Manager
UCSD
Natural Reserve System
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA 92093-0116

SUBJECT: 2004 UCSD Long Range Development Plan EIR

Dear Ms. Kay:

Please be advised that in response to the request contained in your letter of July 9, 2004, we will extend the EIR public review comment period for the UCSD Natural Reserves to July 23, 2004.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Catherine J. Presmyk
Assistant Director,
Environmental Planning

cc: M. Phegley
July 12, 2004

David Mayer  
California Department of Fish and Game  
4949 Viewridge Avenue  
San Diego, CA 92123

SUBJECT: 2004 UCSD Long Range Development Plan EIR

Dear Mr. Mayer:

Please be advised that in response to your verbal request on July 9, 2004, we will extend the EIR public review comment period for the California Department of Fish and Game to July 14, 2004.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Catherine J. Presmyk  
Assistant Director,  
Environmental Planning

cc: M. Phegley
July 16, 2004

Ms. Sherri Lightner, President
La Jolla Town Council
8551 La Jolla Shores Drive
La Jolla, CA 92037

SUBJECT: 2004 UCSD Long Range Development Plan EIR

Dear Ms. Lightner:

Consistent with my letter to you dated July 9, 2004, the attached table summarizes the implementation of mitigation measures that were identified in the 1989 UCSD LRDP EIR. Information regarding UCSD meetings with City representatives with whom off-campus issues have been discussed is also provided below.

The mitigation monitoring plan described in the 1989 LRDP EIR consisted of three categories: 1) mitigations related to the implementation of future campus projects, 2) mitigations related to maintaining adequate service levels, and 3) administrative measures, independent of specific projects, defined to mitigate certain potential impacts. The specific mitigations falling 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 mitigations. I believe this table demonstrates that mitigation compliance with the 1989 EIR has been very successful.

The University monitors mitigations 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.

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 mitigations. For the most part, those discussions have focused on FBA projects that have been identified to reduce traffic. Also, to maintain communication
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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 (trolley)
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, Department of Fish and Game, San Diego Transit, and the North County Transit
District. These contacts have occurred over the duration of the 1989 LRDP.

As always, we appreciate your interest in UCSD and your concerns about the expected growth of
the campus. Please be assured that we unequivocally share your goal of advancing the quality of
our shared community environment, and we are looking forward to working cooperatively with
you to resolve issues of concern.

Sincerely,

Catherine J. Presmyk
Assistant Director,
Environmental Planning

Attachments

cc: R. Dynes
    M. Fox
    J. Langley
    D. Miller
    M. Phegley
    S. Relyea
    S. Siegel
    J. Steindorf
    J. Woods
July 16, 2004

Ms. Mary Coakley, Secretary
La Jolla Community Planning Association
2120 Vallecitos, #203
La Jolla, CA 92037

SUBJECT: 2004 UCSD Long Range Development Plan EIR

Dear Ms. Coakley:

Consistent with my letter to you dated July 9, 2004, the attached table summarizes the implementation of mitigation measures that were identified in the 1989 UCSD LRDP EIR. Information regarding UCSD meetings with City representatives with whom off-campus issues have been discussed is also provided below.

The mitigation monitoring plan described in the 1989 LRDP EIR consisted of three categories: 1) mitigations related to the implementation of future campus projects, 2) mitigations related to maintaining adequate service levels, and 3) administrative measures, independent of specific projects, defined to mitigate certain potential impacts. The specific mitigations falling 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 mitigations. I believe this table demonstrates that mitigation compliance with the 1989 EIR has been very successful.

The University monitors mitigations 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.

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 mitigations. For the most part, those discussions have focused on FBA projects that have been identified to reduce traffic. 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 (trolley) 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, Department of Fish and Game, San Diego Transit, and the North County Transit District. These contacts have occurred over the duration of the 1989 LRDP.

As always, we appreciate your interest in UCSD and your concerns about the expected growth of the campus. Please be assured that we unequivocally share your goal of advancing the quality of our shared community environment, and we are looking forward to working cooperatively with you to resolve issues of concern.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Catherine J. Presmyk
Assistant Director,
Environmental Planning

Attachments

cc: R. Dynes
    M. Fox
    J. Langley
    D. Miller
    M. Phegley
    S. Relyea
    S. Siegel
    J. Steindorf
    J. Woods
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July 27, 2004

Mr. James W. Royle, Jr., Chairperson
San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc.
P.O. Box 81106
San Diego, California 92138-1106

RE: UCSD 2004 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report

Dear Mr. Royle:

We are in receipt of your July 7, 2004 public review comment letter on the content of the 2004 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report. Pursuant to the request contained therein, we are providing the cited memorandum addressing procedures for the discovery of human remains.

Sincerely,

Catherine Presmyk
Assistant Director,
Environmental Planning

Attachment
MEMORANDUM

TO: Cathy Presmyk
FROM: Devon Muto
DATE: May 2004
PROJECT NO.: 491063

SUBJECT: Procedures for the Discovery of Human Remains at UCSD
CLIENT: UCSD

This memorandum describes the procedures that shall be undertaken in the case of the discovery of human remains at UCSD due to construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed 2004 Long Range Development Plan. The following is based on state law and City of San Diego procedures.

If human remains are discovered, work shall halt in that area and the following procedures set forth in the California Public Resources Code (Sec. 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Sec. 7050.5) will be taken:

a. Notification

(1) Archaeological Monitor shall notify the Project Manager, Physical Planning, and the Principal Investigator (PI), if the Monitor is not qualified as a PI.

(2) The PI shall notify the Medical Examiner after consultation with the Physical Planning, either in person or via telephone.

b. Isolate discovery site

(1) Work shall be redirected from the location of the discovery and any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent human remains until a determination can be made by the Medical Examiner in consultation with the PI concerning the origin of the remains.

(2) The Medical Examiner, in consultation with the PI, shall determine the need for a field examination to determine the origin.

(3) If a field examination is not warranted, the Medical Examiner shall determine, with input from the PI, if the remains are or are most likely to be of Native American origin.

c. If Human Remains are determined to be Native American

(1) Pursuant to California law, the Medical Examiner shall notify the Native American Historic Commission (NAHC).

(2) The NAHC will contact the PI within 24 hours or sooner, after the Medical Examiner has completed coordination.
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(3) NAHC will identify the person or persons determined to be the most likely descendent (MLD).

(4) Disposition of Native American Human Remains will be determined between the MLD and the PI. The PI may make the determination if the NAHC is unable to identify the MLD, or the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the NAHC. If UCSD rejects the recommendation of the MLD and mediation in accordance with PRC 5097.94(k) by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to UCSD, UCSD shall re-inter the human remains and all associated grave goods with appropriate dignity, on the campus in a location not subject to subsurface disturbance. Documentation on this process will be provided to the NAHC

d. If Human Remains are NOT Native American

(1) The PI shall contact the Medical Examiner and provide the Medical Examiner with the historic era and context of the burial.

(2) The Medical Examiner will determine the appropriate course of action with the PI and Physical Planning staff (PRC 5097.98).

(3) If the remains are of historic origin, they shall be appropriately removed and conveyed to the Museum of Man for analysis. The decision for reinterment of the human remains shall be made in consultation with the Museum of Man.
ATTACHMENT 2

1989 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures Implementation Summary Table
### SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION OF 1989 LRDP EIR MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT RELATED ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Noise | 3.3.2.2(b) | The university will incorporate where feasible the following site design measures to reduce long-term noise on campus:  
- Truck access, parking area design, and air conditioning refrigeration units will be carefully designed and evaluated to minimize the potential for acoustic impacts to adjacent noise sensitive department.  
- Building setbacks, building design and orientation will be used to reduce intrusive noise levels at sensitive | Noise reduction measures are identified by planners, architects, and the UCSD Design Review Board as all building projects advanced through the mandatory UCSD design process. |
| Noise | 3.3.2.4 | Although short-term construction noise will not be significant, UCSD will implement the following measures to minimize short-term noise levels caused by construction activities.  
(a) By contract specifications, restrict construction activities adjacent to residential areas to the hours between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM Monday through Saturday.  
(b) By contract specifications, continue to comply with existing City policies that require all construction equipment, fixed | Included in Division 1 (required elements) of the Construction Contract Specifications for all UCSD projects. |
or mobile, be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers;  
(c) By contract specifications, require construction contractors to place stationary equipment in locations such that noise is distributed from sensitive noise receivers; and  
(d) By contract specifications and in consultation with UCSD staff, locate construction staging areas as far as practical from occupied dwellings.

| Noise       | 3.3.3.1 | Compliance with Title 24 of the State Administrative Code and enforcement of the City of San Diego's Noise Ordinance in the surrounding community, in combination with the previously described mitigation measures for on-campus impacts will ensure that any potential cumulative noise impacts are mitigated to below levels of significance for the new development. Cumulative noise impacts on existing sensitive land uses will remain significant.  

UCSD will seek to reduce its contribution to traffic noise by continuing its ridesharing program and supporting transit service (see Sections 3.2 Traffic/Circulation and 3.4 Air Quality respectively, which would have the effect of reducing automobile trips and vehicular noise levels.  

The 1989 LRDP EIR specifically references residential land uses as the "sensitive" land uses that must be protected against adverse noise levels. Title 24 applies in this context to residential land uses and specifically to regulatory interior noise levels. Compliance with mitigation measure 3.3.2.2(a) further ensures Title 24 is met. Mitigation of cumulative off-campus noise impacts is the responsibility of the City of San Diego.  

UCSD has steadily expanded its alternative transportation program since 1989. Refer to 3.1.3.5b and 3.2.2.3.

| Air Quality | 3.4.2.1 | Although not required to mitigate significant impacts, the following measures will be implemented to reduce the fugitive dust generated during individual project construction:  
(a) Contract specifications will require that exposed surfaces and unpaved access roads be frequently watered, as  

Included in Division 1 (required elements) of the Construction Contract Specifications for UCSD projects.
### Air Quality 3.4.2.2

Although short-term air quality impacts due to gaseous emissions would not be significant, UCSD will adopt the following measures to reduce gaseous emissions during construction:

(a) Contract specifications will require that construction equipment be tuned and in good working order to comply with APCD emissions standards.

(b) Contract specifications will require that construction-related trips and work force community be scheduled during non-peak hours to help reduce congestion and potential CO hot spots and intersections.

---

**Air Quality 3.4.2.4**

To reduce energy consumption, and therefore future energy demands, UCSD will adopt the following measures:

(a) Energy efficient lighting fixtures and buildings will be constructed, as appropriate.

(b) New development and campus operations will adhere to the UCSD Energy Conservation Program. The campus will also continue to study the feasibility of converting the existing heating plant to a cogeneration facility to maximize energy efficiency.

---

Pursuant to 1989 LRDP mitigation measures 3.5.2.3(a) and 3.5.2.3(b), the campus evaluates the need for infrastructure expansion on project-specific basis and requires new development to adhere to UCSD energy standards. Project design typically incorporates energy efficient lighting fixtures; occupancy sensors which activate lights when people enter/leave rooms; and double-glazed, and low “E” windows to reduce heat gain/loss throughout the day.

UCSD projects are designed pursuant to the UCSD Energy Conservation program. This requirement is included in the campus facilities manual and in directions to architects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electricity/ Natural Gas</td>
<td>3.5.2.3(b)</td>
<td>In order to conserve energy, new development and campus operations will adhere to the “Facility Design Standard – Energy Standard,” issued by the Office of Facilities Design and Construction (1985).</td>
<td>This mitigation measure is part of standard direction given to architects at initiation of project development at UCSD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td>3.6.2.1(d)</td>
<td>All development proposed in the UCSD Revised LRDP shall be reviewed by the UCSD Fire Marshall and comply with appropriate codes.</td>
<td>All UCSD projects are bid for construction only following UCSD Fire Marshall review and approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology/ Soils/ Topography</td>
<td>3.7.2.1</td>
<td>Appropriate detailed site-specific geotechnical analyses will be conducted prior to implementation of future facility development in a tiered environmental analysis in accordance with CEQA. Mitigation measures identified during these detailed geotechnical analyses would be incorporated into the final project design.</td>
<td>All UCSD building projects require geotechnical analyses and follow recommendations of geotechnical consultants to ensure the structural integrity of building projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology/ Soils/ Topography</td>
<td>3.7.2.2</td>
<td>UCSD will continue to fully comply with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and the Uniform Building Code. Appropriate detailed site-specific geotechnical analyses will be conducted prior to construction of new facilities in a tiered environmental analysis in accordance with CEQA. Such geotechnical analyses will include recommendations regarding foundation and drainage design (surface and subsurface). Mitigation measures identified during detailed geotechnical analysis would be incorporated into the final project design.</td>
<td>All UCSD building projects comply with the California Building Code and Uniform Building Code. This process is administered by the Campus Architect. All building projects prepare geotechnical studies to support design and engineering of projects. Also see mitigation measure 3.7.2.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology/ Soils/ Topography</td>
<td>3.7.2.3</td>
<td>Areas with steep slopes proposed for development will be subject to site-specific geotechnical review. These investigations will include evaluation of slope stability, drainage, erosion, and facility design to mitigate potential threats.</td>
<td>See responses to mitigation measures 3.7.2.1 and 3.7.2.2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
impacts related to slope development. Mitigation measures identified during detailed geotechnical analysis would be incorporated into final project design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geology/Soils/Topography</th>
<th>3.7.3.1(a)</th>
<th>Most steep slopes both within and outside of the coastal zone are protected by the Park land use designation. Development of steep slopes within the coastal zone is reviewed by the Coastal Commission for consistency with the Coastal Act.</th>
<th>UCSD staff routinely seeks Coastal Commission permits for projects within the coastal zone and projects comply with the conditions of such permits.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology/Water Quality</td>
<td>3.8.2.1</td>
<td>Individual development projects will require a site-specific hydrological and drainage analysis prior to project implementation in accordance with CEQA. This would involve appropriate design and location of storm drains to accommodate a design (typically 10-year) storm event, providing onsite runoff storage and/or energy dissipation to regulate onsite runoff volumes and protect downstream drainage facilities, developing comprehensive short- and long-term erosion control plans to minimize erosion both during and after construction (e.g., use of sandbagging during construction and a long-term landscaping plan), and (if necessary) the use of sediment detention facilities to prevent the offsite transport of eroded materials. The results of these investigations would be coordinated with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to insure compliance with all appropriate regulatory standards. Design and mitigation measures identified during hydrologic analysis and agency review would be incorporated into final project design. It is anticipated that potentially significant impacts from development-induced runoff level increases could be reduced below levels of significance.</td>
<td>Hydrology and drainage analyses typically occur during the design development phase of UCSD building projects. In compliance with the federal Clean Water Act, and under RWQCB regulations, measures designed to control stormwater runoff and erosion are prepared and maintained for individual projects. These measures have been analyzed and determined to reduce impacts during individual project review under CEQA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology/ Water Quality</td>
<td>3.8.2.2</td>
<td>Individual development projects will require a site-specific hydrological analysis prior to implementation in accordance with CEQA. This would involve analyses of short- and long-term erosion control measures to minimize offsite sediment transport, the use of native landscaping to reduce pesticide and fertilizer application requirements, and drainage design techniques to reduce the offsite transport of urban contaminants (e.g., the use of onsite ponds or swales). Mitigation measures identified during these investigations would be incorporated into final project design. In addition, UCSD will comply with all existing federal, state, and local guidelines regarding the discharge of contaminants into drainage courses and the preservation of water quality. These include the RWQCB erosion and sedimentation policy, the Federal Clean Water Act, NPDES permit, and guidelines for the use and disposal of hazardous or toxic materials.</td>
<td>See mitigation measure 3.8.2.1 above. It is University policy to comply with all applicable laws and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>3.9.2.1(a)</td>
<td>The northern portion of SDi-525/W-9S is adjacent to the study area and testing has revealed that the majority of this portion of the site remains intact. The exact boundary of the site is unclear and prior to development of the surrounding area, a determination of site boundary needs to be conducted. The W-9E portion of the site, which presently includes the Coast Apartments (married student</td>
<td>No development has occurred on this site (W-9S) since the 1989 LRDP EIR was adopted. The Coast Apartments (W-9E) was renovated in 1998. The Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP) for the renovation project called for a testing program as well as a pre-excavation agreement with the Native American representatives and construction monitoring. Although a human burial was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>3.9.2.1(b)</td>
<td>SDi-201/SDi-4669/W-12 has played a significant role in the development of an understanding of early prehistoric culture in the region. Numerous human burials have been located at this site and the presence of others should be expected. The remaining portions of this resource are significant both archaeologically and in terms of Native American values. In accordance with Appendix K, an archaeologist will be consulted prior to any earthmoving activity associated with landscaping or other improvements within this site area. Cultural resources at this site will either be preserved in situ in the long-term, or an appropriate mitigation program will be carried out in accordance with Appendix K.</td>
<td>unearthed, an effective repatriation process was in place to address the issue when it arose. The human remains were subsequently reburied at a location acceptable to the Native American representative involved with the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Cultural Resources | 3.9.2.2(a) | Further evaluation of the above sites will be conducted prior to development to establish the significance of the resource and to determine the need for and the nature of mitigation measures in accordance with Appendix K of the CEQA Guidelines. The particular issue associated with each site requiring further evaluation is identified below:  
(a) SDi-8468/W-2347 requires assessment of both prehistoric and newly recorded historic components.  
(b) SDi-8469/SD8-7952/W-2348/W-2611 requires assessment of both prehistoric and historic components, although much of the site appears to have been | No development has occurred on the site since the 1989 LRDP EIR was adopted. |

(a, b and c) These sites are largely within UCSD Park and have not been proposed for development during the period since 1989, with the exception of construction of Expedition Way in 1990 along the north edge of the sites. Archeological testing was undertaken in 1988 and 1990. The test
(c) SDi-11019 and SDi-8471B/W-2339 are probably associated and should be considered as one site. Testing has been conducted by Cheever and Wade (1988) and further evaluation is desired to determine site importance and boundary before development. As part of the assessment, association with site W-9N and W-9E should be determined.

(d) W-199 requires evaluation for size, content, and importance, especially since intact portions are probably still present along the southwestern portion of SIO.

(e) SDi-8470/W-2349 was recommended for further evaluation by Hanna (1979). Examination of soil profiles is recommended to resolve whether this site represents fill from Site W-9. If it is, then no further work is recommended; if the site contains an intact lower component, then further analysis should be conducted.

(f) SDi-8472/W-2341 contains both historic and prehistoric components. For the historic component, as well as for all historic structures associated with Camp Matthews and Camp Callan, a complete history should document the location of camp features and include a discussion of the significance of existing history remains and gaps in existing historic data. Based on the results of the historic study, mitigation measures can be developed as needed for the entire complex, allowing impacts to be mitigated.

(d) W-199 is confined to coastal bluff top locations from the SIO pier area and south. Recent demolition of two wings of Ritter Hall and creation of the Pawka Green at SIO were outside the site boundaries of W-199. The 2003 CEQA Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Robert Paine Scripps Center requires archeological monitoring on the site once construction begins.

(e) The majority of this site rests under a parking lot built in the mid 1980’s. There has been no further development on this site since 1989.

(f) These sites have not been proposed for development during the period since 1989. (Refer to mitigation measure 3.9.2.2(b)).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
<th>3.9.2.2(b)</th>
<th>Historic structures will be evaluated for their importance in accordance with Appendix K of the CEQA Guidelines, prior to any development which would affect them. Potential impacts will be mitigated on a project-by-project basis.</th>
<th>The campus evaluates buildings on a case-by-case basis to determine if they meet the threshold for historic structures. In addition, the campus conducted a survey of all military remnant buildings in 1998. (See mitigation measure 3.9.2.2.a).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paleontological Resources</td>
<td>3.10.2.1</td>
<td>Further evaluation of identified paleontological resource potential is necessary to establish the significance of the resource and to determine the need for and nature of mitigation measures. This will be conducted on a site-specific basis prior to development in a tiered environmental analysis in accordance with CEQA. Potentially significant impacts to paleontological resources will be mitigated to below levels of significance through standard inventory, monitoring, and collection techniques prior to project development.</td>
<td>As required by project specific CEQA analysis, approximately 12 projects have been monitored for Paleontological resources since the 1989 LRDP was adopted. No significant resources have been identified during construction monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic/Visual Resources</td>
<td>3.12.1</td>
<td>Future development will be subject to a project-by-project review that will ensure conformance to the five planning principles contained in the UCSD Revised LRDP, the campus lighting policy, and other appropriate guidelines.</td>
<td>Projects are individually evaluated for consistency with the five Planning Principles of the 1989 LRDP, the Campus Lighting Policy, and other campus guidelines throughout the project design process to promote visual and aesthetic compatibility. In addition, any potential issues are further analyzed as part of the project specific CEQA environmental evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic/Visual Resources</td>
<td>3.12.2</td>
<td>Project-by-project review for conformance with the five planning principles contained in the UCSD Revised LRDP will be performed by UCSD.</td>
<td>This mitigation was implemented in projects in Key Viewshed Area 1 in the EIR. These project-by-project reviews maintained view corridors both east and west from Ridge Walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic/Visual Resources</td>
<td>3.12.3</td>
<td>In order to preserve the natural feeling of the Park to the west of these land uses, the perimeter around these land uses shall be adequately landscaped to screen these uses</td>
<td>This mitigation was implemented in the design of the Campus Services Complex and Biology Field Station project, resulting in a landscape buffer at the corner of Interstate 5 and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
from off-site. This is consistent with mitigation proposed in the Final EIR on the proposed Campus Services Complex and Biology Field Station (SCH #87102108).

| Aesthetic/ Visual Resources | 3.12.4(a) | Landscaping (including trees) shall be incorporated into the plans for future structures in order to screen views of buildings and parking lots as appropriate. | This mitigation measure applied to three locations (the Gliderport, and two areas at SIO). No development has occurred in these areas since adoption of the 1989 LRDP. |
| Aesthetic/ Visual Resources | 3.12.4(b) | UCSD will perform a design review of major projects to ensure that they conform to the planning principles of the UCSD Revised LRDP. | This mitigation measure applied to three locations (the Gliderport, and two areas at SIO). No development has occurred in these areas since adoption of the 1989 LRDP. |

### SERVICE LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use-Housing</td>
<td>3.1.3.4</td>
<td>Although regional housing supply would not be significantly adversely affected by implementation of the UCSD Revised LRDP, and mitigation measures are not required. Also, the university will continue to aggressively seek opportunities and funding to provide more housing in striving to achieve a higher percentage. UCSD has committed sufficient land at high enough densities to accommodate its targeted 50 percent of the student enrollment. Even if housing cannot be provided for 50 percent of the students, it appears there would be sufficient housing supply in the surrounding region to meet the demand. At a minimum, the university is committed to accommodating at least 38 percent of enrollment in 2005 and has performed a financial feasibility analysis to demonstrate that this level is attainable. Even if only 38 percent of the students are housed on campus, the project will not result in</td>
<td>This impact does not call for mitigation. Since 1989, the campus has developed about 2,290 additional housing beds comprising almost 1 million gross square feet at a cost of $149 million. Currently, two new campus housing projects are being planned to provide about 1,800 additional campus housing beds by 2008-9 at a cost of more than $180 million.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
significant adverse impacts to the regional housing supply.

| Land Use-Parking | 3.1.3.5(a) | The UCSD Revised LRDP projects that by the year 2005, approximately 25,230 spaces will be provided (Table 3-6). This increase in parking represents an increase in the spaces per capita and may help alleviate the parking competition off campus in the surrounding communities. | In 2002-03, over 17,650 spaces were in operation on campus. The projected parking supply for 2005 that was identified in the 1989 LRDP was 25,230 spaces. However, neither the potential level of development nor the campus population totals projected for 2005 have been reached. Thus complete mitigation for this impact is not required. In 2003-04, the campus parking system typically operated with more than 1,500 vacant spaces at peak occupancy. |
| Land Use-Parking | 3.1.4.1(a) | The UCSD Revised LRDP will partially offset this competition for parking spaces by providing an estimated 25,230 parking spaces through the term of the plan. Specific parking improvement projects are in various stages of planning, design and implementation; it is currently projected that the ratio of parking spaces per capita would increase slightly through the 2005/6 planning horizon of the UCSD Revised LRDP. | See mitigation measure 3.1.3.5(a) above. |
| Traffic | 3.2.2.1(a) | The 1987 University Community Plan includes a series of circulation improvements to be implemented by the City to accommodate the projected growth in traffic volumes which included assumptions about increased traffic at UCSD that account for the UCSD Revised LRDP. These traffic improvements, which are planned and, when implemented, would achieve the City of San Diego’s minimum acceptable standards or better for the circulation system around UCSD, include:
   (a) Widen Genesee Avenue from 6 lanes to 8 lanes from Nobel Drive to State Route 52.
   (b) Widen La Jolla Village Drive to 8 lanes west of Interstate 5 to La Jolla Village Drive (sic; Transportation improvement projects that are identified in the Community Plan are generally implemented through the North University City Public Facilities Financing Plan and Facilities Benefit Assessment (FBA), last adopted by San Diego City Council on June 29, 2004. The identified projects have been (and continue to be) implemented on an incremental basis as development occurred within the community. The responsibility for project implementation rests solely with the City of San Diego. The status of specific projects follows: |
should be Gilman) and widen La Jolla Village Drive bridge over Gilman to 6 lanes.
(c) Construct a full interchange of Interstate 805 at Nobel Drive.
(d) Complete the widening of North Torrey Pines Road to 6 lanes from Genesee Avenue to Torrey Pines grade.
(e) Construct a “special treatment” on Genesee Avenue at Torrey Pines Road and John Hopkins Drive.
(f) Improve the Interstate 5/Genesee Avenue interchange.
(g) Construct special treatment, consisting of additional turn lanes, on Genesee Avenue from Interstate 5 to Nobel Drive.
(h) Provide special treatment, consisting of additional turn lanes and possibly tunneling, at the La Jolla Village Drive/Torrey Pines Road intersection.
(i) Widen La Jolla Village Drive to 8 lanes from Towne Center Drive to Interstate 805.
(j) Widen La Jolla Village Drive to 6 lanes plus turn lanes as required from Lebon Drive to Regents Road.
(k) Provide missing ramps at the Interstate 5/Ardath Road interchange.
(l) Construct a half-diamond interchange with ramps to and from the north on Interstate 805 at Eastgate Mall.
(m) Dedicate John Jay Hopkins Drive and improve it as a 4-lane major street; dedicate Tower Road and improve it as a 4-lane collector; and extend Estuary Way as a 2-lane collector from Roselle Street to Sorrento Valley Road.

(a) This is project NUC-A of the FBA. The EIR for the project is scheduled to be completed in November 2004. Project construction is scheduled for Fiscal Year 2011.
(b) Project NUC-47. Construction contract awarded by City. Project completion is estimated to be FY 2006.
(c) Project NUC-21. Half-diamond interchange (south-facing ramps) completed.
(d) This project is described in the community plan as widening from Torrey Pines Scenic Drive north to the Callan Road bridge. The segment from Torrey Pines Scenic Drive to Genesee Avenue was completed as part of NUC-E. The segment north of Genesee Avenue has also been completed.
(e) The community plan identifies “special treatment” as “flyovers, additional lanes, etc.). The project (NUC-E) has been completed.
(f) Project NUC-24 will widen the overpass. Other project components are identified in the FBA as regionally funded improvements. The EIR for all aspects of the project is scheduled for completion in FY 2006. Project construction is scheduled for FY 2008.
(pending regional funding).

(g) This project will be accomplished in three phases, NUC-3 (scheduled for construction in FY 2005), NUC-G (in FY 2005) and NUC-52 (in FY 2008).

(h) This project is not specifically identified in the community plan or the FBA. Additional turn lanes at this intersection are provided as part of NUC-47, scheduled for construction in FY 2005.

(i) Project NUC-47, scheduled for FY 2005.

(j) Project completed.

(k) FBA notes that “Two feasibility studies were conducted and this project proved to be too costly to undertake. In addition, there were safety and stability issues. The project was deleted from the FBA in 1997.”

(l) This project is not specifically identified in the community plan or the FBA. It would appear to be very difficult to construct given the grade difference between I-805 and Eastgate Mall.

(m) The dedication and improvement of John Jay Hopkins Drive has been completed. There are no specific references to Tower Road or Estuary
| Utilities | 3.5.2.1 | As development occurs, the need for specific infrastructure improvements will continue to be analyzed in accordance with CEQA. The university will make improvements on campus as required to ensure an adequate water supply for the university population and for fire protection. UCSD would be responsible for financial obligations attributable to expansion of local water facilities to the extent required by law. UCSD will coordinate with the SDCWA to facilitate water shortfall planning. This may include adoption of emergency water priority designations on campus, including identification of nonessential uses and scheduling of water allocations. | Water supply improvements have not been required. UCSD FD&C and Auxiliary & Plant Services monitor UCSD water use. Since 1989, UCSD has installed low water use fixtures in bathrooms and installed recycled water infrastructure for landscape irrigation. |
| Utilities | 3.5.2.2 | As development occurs, the need for on-campus infrastructure improvements will continue to be analyzed on a site-specific basis in accordance with CEQA. | Infrastructure needs are assessed on both campuswide and project specific levels and improvements are made as necessary as part of the UCSD design process. The CEQA evaluation occurs on a project specific basis. |
| Utilities | 3.5.2.3(a) | As development occurs, the need for infrastructure improvements will continue to be analyzed on a site-specific basis in accordance with CEQA. The university will make improvements as required to ensure adequate electric and natural gas systems exist. | As stated in 3.5.2.2, UCSD monitors and improves infrastructure based on demand, both at the project and campuswide levels. Since 1989, chillers, boilers, cooling towers, a thermal energy storage tank and a cogeneration turbine have been added to the campus Central Utility Plant to meet increases in demand for electricity (and hot and chilled water). A second utility plant was built on East Campus, north of the Shiley Eye Center, to meet demand associated with the growing east campus medical facilities. |
| Utilities | 3.5.3.1 | UCSD will coordinate with the City of San Diego and SDCWA to identify methods for reducing water | UCSD has steadily worked with the City of San Diego to expand the use of reclaimed |
| Community Services | 3.6.2.1(a) | As development occurs under the UCSD Revised LRDP, the campus will continue to assess the adequacy of fire services available to the campus in accordance with CEQA. This will include coordination between the UCSD Fire Marshall and the City Fire Department to ensure adequate consideration of fire protection needs on campus. | The UCSD Fire Marshall analyzes fire service during project design, and adequate fire lanes and fire protection are incorporated into projects. The UCSD Fire Marshall ensures compliance with City of San Diego requirements for fire access and service, including support facilities (such as fire hydrants), and makes certain that appropriate fire resistant building design measures and materials are incorporated into each project. In other planning studies, the UCSD Fire Marshall is involved in planning for adequate fire service for the campus. |
| Community Services | 3.6.2.1(b) | The City of San Diego Fire Department can and should add personnel and equipment as necessary to provide adequate fire protection service within its jurisdiction, including the UCSD campus. | UCSD has steadily informed both SANDAG and the City of San Diego of campus growth patterns so that effective and comprehensive regional planning could advance. The City of San Diego plans for the provision of appropriate levels of community services, including fire personnel and equipment. |
| Community Services | 3.6.2.2(a) | As development under the LRDP occurs, the campus will hire additional police officers and support staff as necessary to maintain an adequate level of service and will expand the existing UCSD police facility when additional space is required. | UCSD police track and maintain acceptable officer to population ratios. There were 27 sworn officers in 1989 and 29 sworn officers in 2003. Relocation and expansion of UCSD police facilities was planned and approved in 2002. |
3.6.2.2(b) The City of San Diego Police Department can and should add new personnel and facilities as necessary to maintain an adequate level of service. UCSD has steadily informed both SANDAG and the City of San Diego of campus growth patterns so that effective and comprehensive regional planning could advance. Consequently, the City of San Diego has planned for the provision of appropriate levels of community services, including police personnel and equipment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use-Parking</td>
<td>3.1.3.5(b)</td>
<td>To further reduce the dependence on automobiles, and hence parking demand, the UCSD Revised LRDP promotes continued efforts at increasing use of the university’s ridesharing program. In addition, UCSD supports and is actively working with MTDB to locate a Light Rail Transit Station on campus. Finally, UCSD provides free bus passes to students and faculty that can be used within a two mile radius of the university.</td>
<td>UCSD has successfully expanded ridesharing and alternative transportation since 1989. UCSD has been and will continue to work with SANDAG (previously MTDB) to locate Light Rail Transit (LRT) on campus and bring super-loop hi-circulator bus service to campus. Through parking fees, UCSD provides a subsidy in excess of $200,000 per year to San Diego Transit so that “free” bus passes may be distributed to students, faculty, and staff to promote mass transit ridership. From 1991 to 2004 UCSD’s alternative transportation ridership increased 49% and thus reduced parking traffic and demand for about 5,000 parking spaces (assuming one person per car). UCSD’s alternative transportation programs, carpools, vanpools, and shuttles, are funded by UCSD parking fees at a cost of about $4 million per year. UCSD has worked and will continue to work with SANDAG (MTDB) to locate a LRT (San</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use-Parking</td>
<td>3.1.3.5(c)</td>
<td>Implementation of a preferential residential permit parking program in the vicinity of the UCSD Campus by the City of San Diego would reduce competition for off-campus street parking. However, this measure is within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City, not the university.</td>
<td>The City of San Diego has implemented parking restrictions in a few areas near campus. In those areas (e.g., La Jolla Farms Rd.), it has been successful in reducing transient parking. The City of San Diego is responsible for the control of both on-street and off-street parking in neighborhoods surrounding UCSD. Since 1989, although the City has not implemented a widespread residential permit parking program in the vicinity of UCSD, the campus has consistently indicated that it would cooperate if such actions are deemed necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>3.2.2.3</td>
<td>UCSD Transportation Alternatives Office will continue to implement its transportation alternatives program, which has successfully encouraged the use of free bus passes, car/van pooling, bus riding, bicycling, and walking. UCSD has its own ridesharing program coordinated through the parking permit process and ridesharing boards (for matching interested ridesharing parties). Interested parties interface with the regional car pooling program match list (Caltrans). The University also has thirteen vans available for van pooling.</td>
<td>UCSD has successfully expanded the transportation alternatives program since 1989. From 1991 to 2004 UCSD’s alternative transportation ridership increased 49%. UCSD’s alternative transportation programs (carpools, vanpools, and shuttles) are funded primarily by parking fees. UCSD has continued the UCSD Shuttle operations including the Hillcrest, City, Campus Loop, and East Campus parking lot. UCSD has expanded vanpools from 13 in 1989 to 29 in 2003. Also refer to 3.1.3.5b. UCSD has been and will continue to coordinate with and vigorously support SANDAG’s efforts to bring LRT to the campus and the surrounding the area. UCSD has effectively worked with SANDAG/MTDB to locate a light rail transit (San Diego Trolley).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
northern expansion corridor and community shuttle system.

In addition, the following measures will reduce impacts to the identified problem intersections, but significant adverse impacts remain.

(a) Continued operation of the UCSD shuttle;

(b) Inclusion of stops adjacent to UCSD as part of a proposed North University City Shuttle;
(c) Proposals to include an LRT station on campus;
(d) Proposals for expansion of designated bike lanes that would not conflict with pedestrian routes;
(e) Inclusion of bike lanes with new campus major roadways; and

(f) Proposals to create or reinforce pedestrian walkways as follows:
• A “ridge walk” extending from Revelle to the northern end of the central portion of extension and stations on campus. Current discussions with SANDAG involve coordinating campus land use and shuttle operations to maximize Trolley ridership. The timing of the development and operation of the Trolley is the responsibility of SANDAG.

(a) The shuttle has continued and expanded since 1989. The newest addition in 2002-03 is City Shuttle.
(b) The North University Shuttle was never implemented.
(c) Working with SANDAG (MTDB) to site two stations on campus rather than the one station envisioned in the early 1990’s.
(d+e) In 1993 UCSD conducted a Bicycle Circulation and Bicycle Parking Planning Study that provided for expanded bicycle lanes and routes, and support facilities such as bike parking and showers to promote bike usage. The Study is used during development project design, and campus roadway and path planning. No new major roadways or bike lanes have been built on campus since 1989, however, UCSD has installed bike racks, showers, and racks on some shuttles, and is studying options to include bike lanes on Gilman Drive,
(f) Pedestrian walkways have been planned for and enhanced. The campus has implemented Ridge Walk (formerly Highway 101), and the Library Walk project was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Quality</th>
<th>3.4.2.3(a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Continuation and possible expansion of the following measures, already in place on the campus, will partially mitigate future air quality impacts. The ridesharing program, which received a Governor’s Transportation Award for substantially reducing commuter traffic, is part of a Transportation Alternatives program at UCSD which serves the transportation needs of students, faculty and staff at the campus. The campus vanpool fleet has expanded to thirteen 15-passenger vehicles, the largest vanpool program in the San Diego area. UCSD surveys show that of the 30,000 people who enter the campus each day (including those that come and go several times a day), 45 percent do so in vehicles other than sole occupant automobiles. There are more than 4500 carpools operating at UCSD (UCSD 1988).

In addition, UCSD operates its own internal shuttle bus system which makes distant parking lots on campus more accessible for commuters. It also has a shuttle bus system from the La Jolla campus to the Uptown Campus. In addition, UCSD subsidizes a bus pass program for use on San Diego Transit buses, which service the communities bordering the campus by providing free passes to all students, faculty and staff. Over 1600 people arrive on campus each day via bus transit (UCSD 1988).

From 1991 to 2004 UCSD’s alternative transportation ridership increased 49% which has helped to reduce air pollution. UCSD’s alternative transportation programs (carpools, vanpools, and shuttles) are funded by UCSD parking fees to the amount of $4 million per year. UCSD’s Transportation and Parking Services operates a natural gas shuttle between the Coaster station and campus that has reduced air pollution, and electric carts are used routinely on the campus. | completed in 1995. The “Muir walk” LRT pedestrian concept has not been implemented because the LRT project has not yet advanced. However, multiple walk extensions to the proposed LRT station west of Interstate 5 have been studied by UCSD; two East-West walks, Lyman Lane and Rupertus Walk, have been defined in a planning study. |
Air Quality 3.4.2.3(b) UCSD is currently looking at other methods of reducing traffic on and around the campus. These methods include reducing the number of commuters by housing more students on campus, and reducing traffic congestion near the campus through the use of alternative modes of transportation. Specifically, one of the goals of the LRDP is to increase the on-campus housing to a 50 percent student on-campus residency rate in order to cut down on the number of students who must commute. To the extent that this occurs, air quality impacts would be further reduced. The San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) plans to locate a light rail transit (LRT) station near or on the university. UCSD is participating in studies associated with the LRT project with one intent being to reduce vehicular traffic resulting from the UCSD Revised LRDP implementation.

Refer to 3.1.3.4 and 3.2.2.3.

Air Quality 3.4.2.5 The University shall comply with all federal, state, and local rules and regulations relating to toxic air contaminants, including the Federal Clean Air Act, the State Air Toxics Hot Spot Information and Assessment Act (“Air Toxics Act”) and other applicable requirements.

The UCSD campus EH&S office recently submitted a toxic air emissions inventory plan to the San Diego APCD in accordance with the Air Toxics Act. Following review and approval of the inventory plan, the campus will prepare an emissions inventory of toxic air emissions. Based on the inventory results, the San Diego APCD may also require the campus to prepare a health risk assessment. The campus will comply with these Air Toxics Act requirements throughout the planning horizon.

It is University policy to comply with all applicable laws.

The campus has complied with this mitigation measure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>3.4.3.1</td>
<td>The University will continue to participate in ridesharing/car pooling programs, their internal shuttle program, and other methods of reducing traffic on- and off-campus. In addition, UCSD will continue to develop energy efficient buildings and use the Energy Conservation Program to reduce energy consumption on campus, reducing energy emissions in the local airshed.</td>
<td>Refer to mitigation measure 3.2.2.3 and 3.4.2.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>3.5.2.1</td>
<td>As development occurs, the need for specific infrastructure improvements will continue to be analyzed in accordance with CEQA. The university will make improvements on campus as required to ensure an adequate water supply for the university population and for fire protection. UCSD would be responsible for financial obligations attributed to expansion of local water facilities to the extent required by law. UCSD will coordinate with SDCWA to facilitate water shortfall planning. This may include adoption of emergency water priority designations on campus, including identification of nonessential uses and scheduling of water allocations.</td>
<td>Refer to mitigation measure 3.5.3.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Water</td>
<td>3.5.3.2</td>
<td>The City of San Diego and EPA can and should resolve the dispute over secondary wastewater treatment, so that compliance with the 1972 Clean Water Act is achieved.</td>
<td>This mitigation measure is not within the University's jurisdiction. However, EPA and the City of San Diego have resolved the dispute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td>3.6.2.1(c)</td>
<td>The campus will maintain and update, as necessary, its emergency response plan to more effectively plan for and utilize fire and other emergency services.</td>
<td>UCSD maintains an Emergency Response Plan that is coordinated by the Environmental Health and Safety Department (EH&amp;S).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>3.6.2.3</td>
<td>UCSD will continue to support recycling and waste reduction efforts as described under existing conditions.</td>
<td>UCSD has been very successful in its efforts to support and increase waste reduction efforts. A recycling and waste reduction summary report was prepared in 1992. A waste minimization committee was formed in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Hazardous Waste

**3.6.2.4(a)** The campus will continue its compliance with hazardous materials laws and regulations and will continue to strengthen its hazardous waste minimization program.

UCSD has a comprehensive health and safety program that ensures compliance with hazardous materials regulations. UCSD has strengthened its hazardous waste minimization program (see mitigation measure 3.6.2.4(b) below).

**3.6.2.4(b)** Existing waste minimization efforts by the EH&S Office will be strengthened and particular consideration will be given to the following strategies:
- Monitoring of hazardous materials purchase, storage, and handling procedures.
- Recycling and source reduction goals and implementation procedures.
- Informational and educational programs.

UCSD constructed a Materials Handling Facility on campus in 1993-4 to better and more efficiently package and handle hazardous materials generated by campus operations. In addition, a chemical recycling program (Chemcycle) was implemented in the late 1990’s to promote reuse and proper handling of typical laboratory chemicals. UCSD EH&S has developed extensive informational and education programs to serve UCSD faculty, staff and students. (Website: [http://blink.ucsd.edu/Blink/External/Topics/Policy/0,1162,15498,00.html](http://blink.ucsd.edu/Blink/External/Topics/Policy/0,1162,15498,00.html)). See also mitigation measure 3.6.2.3.

### Geology/ Soils/ Topography

**3.7.3.1(b)** Development of steep slopes in the communities surrounding the campus is subject to the City of San Diego ordinances described above. This is not within the jurisdiction of UCSD and no action is necessary.

### Cultural Resources

**3.9.2.1(c)** Site SDi-9288C/W-2351 is located on the eastern portion of the campus in an area designated for Recreation. Previous mitigation recommendation for this historic site includes the preservation of the site. UCSD implemented this recommendation in the early 1990’s (refer to mitigation measure 3.9.2.2(b)).
booth and subsequent treating of the interior walls with a clear protective coating and possibly establishing a small interpretive station to document the historical role of Camp Matthews (Hanna 1979). This program will be carried out in a timely manner to prevent vandalism at this site.

| Cultural Resources | 3.9.2.2(a) | Further evaluation of the above sites will be conducted prior to development to establish the significance of the resource and to determine the need for and the nature of mitigation measures in accordance with Appendix K of the CEQA Guidelines. The particular issue associated with each site requiring further evaluation is identified below:

(a) SDi-8468/W-2347 requires assessment of both prehistoric and newly recorded historic components.
(b) SDI-8469/SD8-7952/W-2348/W-2611 requires assessment of both prehistoric and historic components, although much of the site appears to have been destroyed.
(c) SDi-11019 and SDi-8471B/W-2339 are probably associated and should be considered as one site. Testing has been conducted by Cheever and Wade (1988) and further evaluation is desired to determine site importance and boundary before development. As part of the assessment, association with site W-9N and W-9E should be determined.
(d) W-199 requires evaluation for size, content, and importance, especially since intact portions are probably still present along the southwestern portion of SIO.
(e) SDi-8470/W-2349 was recommended for further evaluation by Hanna (1979).

a-e) Assessments would only be undertaken if proposed projects would impact these sites. Many of these sites are in the UCSD Park and were not impacted since 1989 (see mitigation measures 3.9.2.2(a) and 3.9.2.2(b)).
**Examination of soil profiles** is recommended to resolve whether this site represents fill from Site W-9. If it is, then no further work is recommended; if the site contains an intact lower component, then further analysis should be conducted.

(f) SDI-8472/W-2341 contains both historic and prehistoric components. For the historic component, as well as for all historic structures associated with Camp Matthews and Camp Callan, a complete history should document the location of camp features and include a discussion of the significance of existing history remains and gaps in existing historic data. Based on the results of the historic study, mitigation measures can be developed as needed for the entire complex, allowing impacts to be mitigated on a project-by-project basis.

f) All military remnants have been evaluated for their importance pursuant to CEQA. This is documented in a report entitled “Review of a History of U.S. Army Camp Robert E. Callen and U.S. Marine Corps Camp Calvin B. Matthews,” which concluded that the military remains do not retain integrity of location and feeling, overall do not possess sufficient integrity of setting or association to qualify for listing in the California Register or National Register of Historic Places as to significant historical resources.
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--oOo--

MR. PHEGLEY: Good evening. This is the Public Hearing for the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the University of California, San Diego Long-Range Development Plan. I'm Milt Phegley. I'm the Campus Community Planner here at UCSD. I'll be guiding myself and some others through our presentation this evening.

What we intend to do -- a brief agenda here -- is review what the purpose of this evening's meeting is, give you a refresher on what an Environmental Impact Report and the Long-Range Development Plan are, talk about the process for developing the Environmental Impact Report for this plan, give you some details in terms of the actual Long-Range Development Plan, discuss what the environmental impacts are that were identified during the environmental review process, review the three individual projects that are included within the Environmental Impact Report and Long-Range Development Plan, and then receive public comments on the Environmental Impact Report.

Participating in this presentation this evening will be Lance Schulte from the Physical Planning Office, and Cathy Presmyk from Environmental Planning. They'll be presenting the Long-Range Development Plan portion, the individual projects portion of the program this evening.
Cathy will be speaking about the environmental issues.

The purpose of this hearing, this meeting this evening is to receive oral comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 2004 Long-Range Development Plan. This is one opportunity, one way of providing comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report. This is the public hearing. Also we will receive comments online through the LRDP website, the address for which is identified in the handout that's on the table here. Then we also will receive written comments. The deadline for submitting comments either online or in written form is July 9th, 2004. So you do not need to speak this evening in order to have your comments placed on the record. You can if you wish, but you also can submit written comments. There is a form on the table by the door that you can write your comments on and turn that in this evening, or you can return that to us by mail. You also can provide us with a letter or any other type of written comment that you would like.

So, briefly, what is the Long-Range Development Plan? The Long-Range Development Plan is a document which is developed by the campus approximately once every 15 years to guide the future development of the campus. It's a general land use plan and capacity analysis. It provides, as I said, a guide for the physical development of the
campus. It's a broad, coherent and adaptable policy framework that provides information in terms of how it is expected the campus will develop in the forthcoming years.

What the Long-Range Development Plan does not provide for is a detailed plan of how the campus would develop. It does not identify building sites or what particular buildings would go in any particular location. It's not a commitment to specific projects, and it also does not contain a construction schedule or funding priorities for the development of the campus.

The tasks that are involved in environmental review and which result in an Environmental Impact Report are, first, an identification of environmental issues. Cathy will be going into more detail about that in a moment. Then once the environmental issues are identified, there's an assessment done of the impacts that would result from the implementation of the plan. Mitigation measures to reduce the significance of those impacts are then considered. That results in the finalization of a Draft Environmental Impact Report.

That Draft Environmental Impact Report is then circulated for public review to interested persons and agencies, in this case, for a 45-day public review period. Public comments are accepted during that time. Then a formal response to those comments -- a written response to
those comments is prepared. Those are then included in the
Final Environmental Impact Report, which will be then
considered by the Board of Regents before they adopt the
Long-Range Development Plan and certify the Environmental
Impact Report.

Also contained in the final EIR will be a
mitigation monitoring and reporting program, which will
identify the mitigation measures that have been proposed in
the EIR, and how the success of those is going to be
measured, who's going to be responsible for ensuring that
those mitigation measures are implemented.

The EIR that we have prepared for the Draft
Environmental Impact Report, the process for that actually
began almost a year ago. We held two hearings, in August
and December, where we issued a Notice of Preparation, which
indicated that an Environmental Impact Report was being
prepared, and invited comments from the public, both in
writing and at scoping meetings in terms of what issues
people wanted to see addressed, how they wanted to see them
addressed, and just to make sure that we were including in
our environmental review all the issues that we might need
to respond to during the process.

We've now completed that Draft Environmental
Impact Report. It's actually four volumes, 2300 pages. Two
of the volumes are sitting there over on the table, and
members of the audience also have two of the other volumes. If you would like to take a look at it before you leave, you're certainly welcome to. But we would ask that the review copies be -- the review volumes be returned before you leave.

FEMALE VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE: Is this draft going to be posted online?

MR. PHEGLEY: Yes. The draft plan is posted on the website, and that website is the LRDP website that's identified in the handout.

So we have prepared the Draft Environmental Impact Report. We're now in the public review period. That will extend, as I said, through July 9th, 2004. Following that, we will be preparing the response to public comments for inclusion in the Final Environmental Impact Report. That final report will then be submitted to the Board of Regents for their consideration in September of this year.

With that, Lance is going to talk about the Long-Range Development Plan.

MR. SCHULTE: Thank you for coming out on such a nice day to come and hear our presentation and to make comments.

This is a graphic that you have in the back of your handout that actually is the land use plan for the 2004 Long-Range Development Plan. If you're at all familiar with
the 1989 Long-Range Development Plan for the campus, you'll
know that this plan is very, very similar to that plan as
far as where it allocates land uses on campus and how it
preserves open space in the park, for instance.

One of the unique features that has come out of
this land use plan is incorporation of an assumed light rail
transit system onto campus that will help with traffic
congestion and also improve accessibility to campus, both
for students, faculty and staff. That area actually has to
come through one of our park areas, so we've incorporated
that in this diagram.

Let's see. As Milt had mentioned, what the LRDP
is and what the LRDP is not, the Long-Range Development Plan
is actually a capacity model. What it does is it really
indicates the largest capacity that we envision on the
campus for a certain period of time. What the numbers show
is our current population of students, faculty, researchers
and staff and what this long-range capacity is identified
for in the LRDP in the year 2020/2021. One thing it is not,
it is not an assumed growth or a definitive growth target.
What it is is it's basically a cap for that period of time
under which this LRDP would be valid.

For instance, the current 1989 LRDP predicted
growth -- far more growth on campus than what actually
occurred. So we're actually underneath what we projected
out in 1989.

This slide indicates what we currently have on campus as far as the actual gross square footage, and what the -- again, that maximum potential capacity of gross square footage could be in the year 2020/2021.

This slide illustrates existing buildings on campus. This is a building footprint. If you were a bird flying up above, this is kind of the roof outline that you would see in blue. It says about 10 million square feet -- gross square feet.

This is a conceptual representation, just kind of filling in what could be about 19 million square feet in the year 2020.

And with that, I would like to pass it over to Cathy Presmyk, who will discuss the environmental issues.

MS. PRESMYK: Thank you, Lance.

For preparation of the EIR, we looked at 14 issue categories. They're listed on the board behind me. These issue areas were addressed in detail in the EIR. The analysis basically consisted of documenting existing conditions for each of these issue areas, identifying thresholds against which a detailed impact analysis was prepared also for each of these issue areas. And where we did identify significant impacts, we then began the process of looking to find ways to mitigate for those impacts.
In addition to the analysis that we did for each of the issue areas, we were also required by CEQA to look at alternatives to our proposed project. And for LRDP we did look at four alternatives, the no project alternative, the no growth alternative -- and they are different -- constrained development and increasing our housing from our current projection to basically doubling the housing we're going to put on the campus.

CEQA also requires us to address cumulative impacts. Basically, what that means is that we needed and did consider development of our campus, as well as the expected development in the area. There is a separate and distinct cumulative discussion for every one of the 14 issue areas that I have up on the board behind me.

Now, of the 14 issues, most of these we were able to identify mitigation that reduced impacts that may have been identified to a level below significance. Of course, these significance thresholds are identified in the EIR so you can clearly see what measures we were measuring against to make those conclusions.

There are only four issue areas, probably not surprising to most people, that even with the mitigations that we have incorporated -- and you will see mitigations identified for these issue areas -- there are some aspects of these issue areas that still remain significant.
With that, I'll turn it over to Lance again to talk about our individual projects.

MR. SCHULTE: Thank you.

As you noticed, we have the four documents for the Environmental Impact Report. One of those documents deals with three individual development projects that have separate Environmental Impact Reports just for those projects. I'd like to just go over those three with you right now. The first one is the Hopkins Parking Structure. The second is the San Diego Supercomputer Expansion Project. And the third is the Rady School of Management. This is a new graduate school of management on campus.

This is a location map of where these three projects are located. They're in the north part of campus, east of North Torrey Pines and just south of Genessee, kind of around the RIMAC area, if you're familiar with that.

The Hopkins Parking Structure is proposed in this grassy field at the corner of Vogt and Hopkins. It would provide parking for various land uses around the structure. It would provide about 1400 parking spaces, two full levels below grade, five above. It's on about a two-and-a-half-acre site. The cost is about $29 million. We expect to -- hope to have this construction completed in the summer of 2006.

The San Diego Supercomputer Expansion Site is
directly adjacent to the parking structure and to the north. It is also adjacent to the existing Supercomputer Center. It would approximately double the Supercomputer facilities on campus on about 1.8 acres. It's a $41 million project that would have computer rooms, conference facilities, office, classrooms and an auditorium. Construction is estimated for winter of 2006.

The Rady School of Management is just north of the brand new Elinore Roosevelt College. As it's shown on the map here, there's two phases with that project. It'd be built in two separate phases. Construction is going to be beginning in the fall of this year in interim facilities. It's about almost two-acre site. The first phase would be about 85,000 square feet, and the second phase a little bit larger. It's about a $31 million project that phase one construction we hope to have completed in the fall of 2006.

One of the things that comes out of these projects is that some of the existing surface parking is utilized for the development of these projects. This gives a summary of the parking impacts related to these developments. As you can see at the bottom line with the 1400 spaces with the Hopkins Parking Structure, there would actually be a little over 1100 new parking spaces on campus beyond what we have today.

With that, Milt, shall I turn it over to you?
MR. PHEGLEY: The deadline for receiving public comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report, as we've mentioned, is July 9th. Again, there are three ways to provide those comments. Online comments can be provided through the website. Written comments can also be submitted.

And then oral comments will be received at this hearing this evening. We do have a three-minute time limit per person on the received comments. Again, we have speaker slips. If you intend to speak, we'd like to have you fill out a speaker slip.

The website -- again, this is the website address, and it's identified in the handout so that you can take a look at the Long-Range Development Plan Draft and the Environmental Impact Report Draft and submit comments through the website if you choose to do that.

We will be taking comments this evening. What we would like to do is, if you have questions about any contents of the plan or anything other than process questions, we would like to entertain those after we've concluded the public hearing to receive comments. We'd be more than happy to answer those questions and meet with you after the conclusion of the public hearing if you have questions rather than comments. We certainly then, on the basis of questions and answers that you receive, can submit
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. PHEGLEY: 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. PHEGLEY: Thank you.

Professor Alan Schneider.

DR. SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

I live on Cliffridge Avenue, which is just one
long block off the southwest corner of the campus. I read in the San Diego Union-Tribune yesterday that part of the plan is to ask residents in the neighborhood of the campus to allow parking in their areas. If I understood that correctly, I wish to state that I would be most unhappy if the University asked me to allow our residential street to be made available for campus parking.

MR. PHEGLEY: Thank you.

Pamela Maher.

MS. MAHER: Yeah. I live also near the campus, and I'm also represent the Scripps Estates Associates, which is right next to the campus. One of our major concerns is the impact of new construction on just the aesthetics and atmosphere of the area surrounding our neighborhood. When I read the report, the area that deals -- the chapter that deals with aesthetics, and also land use, the mitigation for those impacts which were noted as being serious, the mitigation was simply having another committee at UCSD review the plans. I mean, that's absurd. You need to have an outside committee. If these buildings or whatever is planned are going to have significant impacts, which your report says they will, then you need people in the community to be able to have some input into the review of those plans. Just having another committee at UCSD review those plans is ridiculous. It's not going to achieve anything.
It's certainly not going to mitigate anything in the eyes of the community.

MR. PHEGLEY: Thank you.

Stan Siegel.

MR. SIEGEL: Yes. Good evening. I'm with the University City Planning Group. First of all, I'd like to just say we love the University, and we'd like to see you grow and expand as you need it. I think that's a very important starting point.

We have become very concerned about density and transportation. One of the things the University, of course, has to provide for is helping its students move in and out. If they live locally, it softens the problem. But if they wind up living farther away, well, then there's more travel. So I would really like to ask you to look at how the student and the support staff and the new faculty are going to be moving in and out of the University. Unfortunately, University City has become an expensive place to live and may be out of reach for some of the students and some of the new faculty that are young and perhaps not trading a house for somewhere else. And certainly the support staff may not even have the income. So all of these transportation demands that the University generates crosses high density areas within the University City surrounding area. So I would like to ask you to take a look at that
impact, and perhaps phase in your growth as the transportation support meets your needs.

Thank you.

MR. PHEGLEY: Thank you.

Richard Chavez.

MR. CHAVEZ: Hi. Richard Chavez. I'm a transportation engineer with the San Diego Association of Governments. I appreciate the presentation tonight -- very well organized, very informative. Thank you for that.

SANDAG is reviewing the environmental document and will be submitting formal comments later. SANDAG Board adopted an alignment for the light rail through the UCSD campus earlier this year. We're working to implement that project as quickly as possible. We're also working with CalTrans on the future widening of Interstate 5 through the campus and hoping to help UCSD meet its transportation needs. But I just wanted to let you know we'll be submitting formal comments later. And we're looking forward to working with you on those future transportation projects.

MR. PHEGLEY: Thank you.

Penelope Bourk.

MS. BOURK: I have a couple of process comments that I'd just like to get on the record. I missed that opportunity. One of those is our continuing concern that we still do not have a list of the unmet mitigations from the
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1989 plan. It's been a few months since we let the University know that we would really like to see that. So it's hard to have a context within which to respond to this without that as background, and we'd really appreciate that. We want really to have that on the record that it hasn't been forthcoming, for whatever reason. I know everyone's busy, and yet it's something that the community would really appreciate having.

MR. PHEGLEY: Well, let me assure you you'll have it within two weeks.

MS. BOURK: Okay. Well, that gives us -- what? -- nine days to respond in the context of the plan. So that's really hard.

MR. PHEGLEY: Okay. We'll try to make it sooner.

MS. BOURK: Okay. The other thing has to do with something that came up at the La Jolla Shores Association meeting recently when Milt was there. While the UC- -- while the Long-Range Development Plan does not go into the details of individual buildings, there is apparently a website that lists those. One would think that by clicking on those, one would come to some information. But apparently it is not posted yet. So people who want to get a more precise idea of some of the buildings that are in the pike really can't have a look at the detail. It has been frustrating to some people. I think that as a process
comment, we suggested at the meeting that maybe you don't have your 45 days of review until in fact the information is available, because otherwise people simply can't review it. So those are my two process comments.

I have gone through the executive summary, and I have sort of a few questions of clarification. One is, in terms of student campus housing, I just sort of want to try and understand something. It would appear that you have about 24,000 students, of which one third, I believe, are housed on campus, which is about 8,000 students. So 16,000 students currently live off campus. And in your plan, you say that one of your alternatives might be to have 100 percent housing for the new students. And yet as I do the numbers, that means you'll still have 15- or 16,000 students living off campus. And I wonder if I've missed something in the numbers. So that's the first question.

The one comment is that I felt the executive summary really down-plays the highly significant proposed increase in staff and faculty. One of the concerns is that as people are older and more advanced in their careers, not only do they come themselves, but they tend to come with families. So while you might have, say, 10,000 faculty and staff, plus maybe you're going to increase graduate students, that means that if those people come with families, rather than just having 10,000 new staff and
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perhaps 3- or 4,000 new graduate students, you have possibly four times that many people coming into the community. And it doesn't seem as if you've made mitigations for those. I mean, there is child care on campus, but children grow. The infrastructure in the current City of San Diego is threatened as it exists already. So we really are concerned that mitigations are going to be met for the increases that you propose. And while it is the charge of the University to provide for 12-whatever percent of high-achieving California students, it isn't necessarily the case that UCSD has to expand infinitely when another possibility might be a campus elsewhere that accommodates so that there is still a reasonable community left in San Diego.

We're still concerned that there doesn't seem to be any dialogue that we know about between the City and the University about the placing of agglomerate groups around the University. And Milt and I have talked about how in the early idea of the University, there was an area to the east in the south section that should've been sort of set aside, but was not, for some of those agglomerates. And as you know from the problems that we've been having with Hillel of San Diego, as an agglomerate if not a technical affiliate of UCSD, it is meant to serve the students of UCSD according to the people who are proposing the project. And it's only one of many unhoused institutions that would typically come
around a university. I brought this up at a previous meeting, and I don't see that we've moved any further to having dialogue between the City and the University that residents could attend so that kind of credibility that this problem's really being dealt with could be built.

In terms of aesthetics, those residents who live on the south edge of campus are watching now the Potlicker Theater go up like an immense wall next to the La Jolla Playhouse, which is another immense wall. You have the sense from that end of the campus that it's kind of a walled fortress. Not only have you the hill, but then you have this huge mass of buildings going across there. It's also happening along North Torrey Pines. And while Milt has said there are little pocket parks planned along the way, the question is whether you could either sort of bring buildings in a little bit so that they aren't a massive sort of 30, 40-foot wall right at the edge of the campus, so either -- there's a technical name for that, and somebody probably knows it, where, you know, you box it in a little bit -- or that there's more of a setback, so that you have a sense from the edge of the campus that it doesn't come as a wall against the community, but there is at least some ease of entering. I know that in the UC Plan, provision was made on the eastern side for there to be a more gradual entrance to the University so it didn't hit you like that.
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. PHEGLEY: 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
are many traffic violations in our area, which is quite near the campus.

That seems like a really flaky way to fund a transportation system, in all honesty. I hope that there will be something more substantial, because we really can't trust a transportation system that is funded by whether or not people break the law.

So, thank you.

MR. PHEGLEY: Thank you.

Mary Coakley.

MS. COAKLEY: Mary Coakley, La Jolla. I can hardly speak with Penny's eloquence or well-studied information of the documents. However, playing fields, as Milt knows, is my passion. I'm hoping that the plan will include, perhaps even as San Diego State has, garage rooftops that will provide playing fields, and some partnership with the community, since the need for fields is extreme.

The other item -- and this is no reflection on Milt, as I told him at the La Jolla Shores Association -- the mitigation for the parking for the University, from my perception, and the cumulative impact and what I see, especially in the Cliffridge community, is unconscionable. For there to be any consideration given to students parking off campus in those areas is also unconscionable. I think
what it's going to force the community to do is to put up requirements and stipulations that limit parking, either with residential passes and one-hour time limits, or some other type of a situation so that the University will at last take responsibility for their own problem. It is your problem, and you are turning it into our community's problem. In that case, the community must deal with it. When you have a jar, and the jar is full, you put the lid on. And I think it's time that the community put the lid on, and the University deal with their problem.

    Thank you.

    MR. PHEGLEY: Thank you.

    Peter Lind.

    MR. LIND: Good afternoon. Peter Lind here tonight on behalf of Courtney Coyle, who couldn't make it here tonight. She's actually in a meeting with the La Jolla Farms Association. As you know, they are your very close and dear neighbors, along with Salk Institute. Some of the cumulative impacts affecting both the homeowners and your neighbors and Salk is the Salk expansion -- a proposed master plan expansion of the Salk campus. We're interested in commenting about perhaps sharing some infrastructure between these -- between Salk and the school where you don't have to reinvent the wheel. Each campus doesn't have to have its own day care facility, or its own super parking
center, or its own recreational fields or activity areas. So we're really looking for some sustainable cooperation to mitigate better these cumulative impacts that are happening out here. These are future proposed projects. Even though it's not a project in the pipeline, you kind of know it's out there and you know it's going to happen. It should be addressed in the EIR.

I think that would just generally be the comments right now. But we will be also providing written comments, as well. Thank you.

MR. PHEGLEY: Thank you.

Linda Colley.

MS. COLLEY: Linda Colley. I'm with the UCPG in University City. We will be sending formal comments and a written essay to you.

I only have two things that are really concerning me right now personally. They have to do with the transportation and the traffic. That seems to be the one cumulative impact that is not really being addressed by UCSD, the State of California, the people of California. It's like we have this traffic problem here. We're going to have this wonderful university. We're going to keep expanding it. We have two wonderful neighborhoods, La Jolla and University City, who are completely impacted by the traffic in and out.
We have transient students who come and live here for four to six years, depending on how long it takes them to get their school. We don't have adequate housing for them.

But what I want to ask tonight is, is it possible to ask the Regents of California to start their own FBA to raise monies to really deal with the transportation issue, problem, traffic? Because it seems to me that we're always told that UCSD is part of our community, but it doesn't have to pay in to the FBA that's in the University Plan. It doesn't pay into anything in La Jolla. But you're here.

You're wonderful. We appreciate you. I am an alumni, so I -- my husband works here -- so I do appreciate this facility. Possibly my children will go here. But in the next ten years, we are going to see so many more people coming here, and we really have to deal with traffic. So we need, you know, the "super loop," we need the trolley, we need more shuttle services. I have to say the University has been wonderful with that. You know, you started your shuttle system, and that is excellent. I think it needs to be expanded.

And then the only other thing is, I've only briefly been able to read this report, and my hat is off to the people who wrote this. I mean, what an incredible endeavor. But I'd like to see a phasing, timing and funding
of an infrastructure required to support this level of
growth. I'd like to see a real phasing plan. I don't know
where that comes in this process, but I just would like to
see that for the community.

Thank you.

MR. PHEGLEY: Thank you.

That concludes comments for which I have speaker
slips. Is there anyone else --

MS. GRANGER: I put one in.

MR. PHEGLEY: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Pat.

It's here somewhere. Yes, Pat Granger. I flipped too fast.

MS. GRANGER: My name is Pat Granger, and I live
in a close neighborhood.

I'm sorry, Milt. We've covered some of this
ground, but I really would like it to go on the record.

Many residents of La Jolla are concerned about the
encroachment of a UCSD affiliated into a single-family
residential neighborhood. Hillel of UCSD -- yes, I suddenly
realize they've changed the name from Hillel of San Diego to
Hillel of UCSD -- is planning a large student center on land
which was designated open space, but was hijacked out of the
La Jolla Community Plan for this purpose. When built, this
student center will funnel 2- to 300 students into a single-
family neighborhood.

In addition, this organization is occupying a
single-family residence and is using it for office space and for preparing food for redistribution on campus. This is also against the Municipal Code and local ordinances. But the City of San Diego and UCSD turn a blind eye to these activities.

Many residents feel that building a UCSD-affiliated student center in a single-family residential neighborhood is a toe in the door -- make that a boot in the door -- to change this multi-racial, multi-cultural neighborhood into a mixed-use area. Think about it. It would be very convenient for UCSD to have a place at hand similar to Isla Vista, the neighborhood adjacent to UC Santa Barbara, an area that would supply students with alternative book shops, coffee shops, off-campus housing, student centers, and other inconvenient developments UCSD would rather see off campus.

It's very easy to believe that this could happen here. At San Diego State University, the Cox Arena was pushed through planning against local objections. What followed was that the neighborhood was completely redeveloped for fraternity houses and student centers. The architect was Mr. Mark Steele, who is also the architect for Hillel of UCSD, an architect for the expansion of the YMCA, and incidentally, the architect and developer at the Naval Training Center.
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. PHEGLEY: Thank you.

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

(No responses.)

MR. PHEGLEY: 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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Monday, June 14, 2004 from 6:00 - 8:00 p.m.
UCSD Chancellors Complex, Room 111A

Comments on the Draft EIR can be provided online or can be mailed to:

Jeffrey A. Steindorf
UCSD Campus Planning
9500 Gilman Drive, MC 0965
La Jolla, CA 92093-0965

All comments must be received by 5 p.m. on July 9, 2004. Should you have any questions, please contact Catherine Presmyk at 858-534-3860. Your prompt review and acknowledgement of this EIR is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jeffery A. Steindorf
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Campus Planning

Encl: 15 Draft EIR summary sections/CDs of LRDP EIR
Environmental Document Transmittal Form/Reviewing Agencies Checklist
Project Location Map

cc: UCOP Planning Design & Construction
UCOP Office of the General Counsel
Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, PO Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 916/445-0613

Project Title: 2004 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP)

Lead Agency: University of California
Street Address: Physical Planning Office, UCSD
City: La Jolla Zip: 92039-0965
County: San Diego

Project Location:
County: San Diego City/Nearest Community: La Jolla
Cross Streets: Gilman Drive and La Jolla Village Drive Zip Code: 92039 Total Acres: 1152
Assessor's Parcel No.: NA Section: 7 Twp: 15S Range: 3W Base: Del Mar
Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: SR 52 and I-5 Waterways: None
Airports: MCAS Miramar Railways: N. County Transit Dist. Schools: San Diego Unif., La Jolla Cnty. Day

Document Type:

CEQA:
- □ NOP
- □ Early Cons (Prior SCH No.)
- □ Neg Dec
- □ Other NOC
- □ Draft EIR

NEPA:
- □ NOI
- □ EA
- □ Draft EIS
- □ FONSI

Other:
- □ Joint Document
- □ Final Document
- □ Other

Local Action Type:
- □ General Plan Update
- □ General Plan Amendment
- □ General Plan Element
- □ Community Plan
- □ Specific Plan
- □ Master Plan
- □ Planned Unit Development
- □ Site Plan
- □ Rezone
- □ Prezone
- □ Use Permit
- □ Land Division (Subdivision, etc.)
- □ Other, Project Approval

Development Type:
- □ Residential: Units    Acres    Water Facilities: Type    MGD
- □ Office: Sq. ft.    Acres    Employees    Transportation: Type
- □ Commercial: Sq. ft.    Acres    Employees    Mining: Mineral
- □ Industrial: Sq. ft.    Acres    Employees    Power: Type    Watts
- □ Educational: Long Range Development Plan; Mgmt. School;
- □ Recreational: Parking Structure; Academic building addition
- □ Waste Treatment: Type
- □ Hazardous Waste: Type
- □ Other:

Funding (approx.): Federal $ - State $ - Total $ -

Project Issues Discussed in Document:
- □ Aesthetic/Visual
- □ Agricultural Land
- □ Air Quality
- □ Archeological/Historical
- □ Coastal Zone
- □ Drainage/Absorption
- □ Economic/Jobs
- □ Fiscal
- □ Flood Plain/Flooding
- □ Forest Land/Fire Hazard
- □ Geologic/Seismic
- □ Minerals
- □ Noise
- □ Population/Housing Balance
- □ Public Services/Facilities
- □ Recreation/Parks
- □ Schools/Universities
- □ Septic Systems
- □ Sewer Capacity
- □ Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading
- □ Solid Waste
- □ Toxic/Hazardous
- □ Traffic/Circulation
- □ Vegetation
- □ Water Quality
- □ Water Supply/Groundwater
- □ Wetland/Riparian
- □ Wildlife
- □ Growth Inducing
- □ Landuse
- □ Cumulative Effects
- □ Other

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:
Academic, Academic/Community-Oriented, Academic/Science Research Park, Administrative, General Sciences, Housing, Medical, Mixed Use, Park, Sports and Recreation, Surface Parking

Project Description:
The 2004 UCSD LRDP will propose general types of development and land use to support projected on-campus population growth at UCSD and to enable expanded and new program initiatives through the 2020-21 academic year. In addition, three specific projects will be analyzed in the LRDP EIR as well. These include a new 1,400 space parking structure, an 85,000 gsf building to house UCSD's new School of Management, and a 80,000 gsf addition to the existing Supercomputer Center Building.
Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Resources Agency
_SX_ Boating & Waterways
_SX_ Coastal Commission
_SX_ Coastal Conservancy
_SX_ Colorado River Board
_SX_ Conservation
_SX_ Fish & Game
_SX_ Forestry & Fire Protection
_SX_ Office of Historic Preservation
_SX_ Parks & Recreation
_SX_ Reclamation Board
_SX_ S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Commission
_SX_ Water Resources (DWR)

Business, Transportation & Housing
_SX_ Aeronautics
_SX_ California Highway Patrol
_SX_ CALTRANS District #11
_SX_ Department of Transportation Planning (headquarters)
_SX_ Housing & Community Development

Food & Agriculture

Health & Welfare
_SX_ Health Services

State & Consumer Services
_SX_ General Services
_SX_ OLA (Schools)

Environmental Protection Agency
_SX_ Air Resources Board
_SX_ California Waste Management Board
_SX_ SWRCB: Clean Water Grants
_SX_ SWRCB: Delta Unit
_SX_ SWRCB: Water Quality
_SX_ SWRCB: Water Rights
_SX_ Regional WQCB #9

Youth & Adult Corrections

Independent Commissions & Offices
_SX_ Energy Commission
_SX_ Native American Heritage Commission
_SX_ Public Utilities Commission
_SX_ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
_SX_ State Lands Commission
_SX_ Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Other

Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)

Starting Date: May 26, 2004
Signature: Catherine Prowse

Ending Date: July 9, 2004
Date: May 25, 2004

Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):
Consulting Firm:
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City/State/Zip:
Contact:
Phone:

For SCH Use Only:
Date Received at SCH:
Date Review Starts:
Date to Agencies:
Date to SCH:
Clearance Date:
Notes:

Applicant:
Address:
City/State/Zip:
Phone:
May 26, 2004

The University of California, San Diego (UCSD) has completed a Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on the proposed campus Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), previously adopted by The Regents of the University of California in November 1989. The 2004 LRDP was updated to address anticipated growth in student enrollment and associated expansion of faculty, staff, academic and ancillary programs, and facilities. UCSD has prepared the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of development projected in the 2004 LRDP. The 2004 LRDP EIR is a Program EIR that will be used at the program level in the environmental review of campus development through horizon year 2020-21. The 2004 LRDP EIR also provides project specific environmental analysis for three building projects proposed for implementation at this time: the Hopkins Parking Structure; San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion; and the Rady School of Management. The 2004 LRDP EIR will serve as the basis for approval of these three projects. The LRDP and project descriptions for the three projects are described in detail in the Draft EIR.

The 2004 LRDP Draft EIR is organized in the following volumes:

- **Volume I**: 2004 LRDP Draft EIR
- **Volume II**: 2004 LRDP EIR technical appendices
- **Volume III**: Project EIRs for:
  - Hopkins Parking Structure
  - San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion
  - Rady School of Management

**Environmental Review and Comment**: The University of California is the Lead Agency and has prepared the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of development projected in the 2004 LRDP. The 2004 LRDP Draft EIR is now available for public review.
The 2004 LRDP Draft EIR is organized in the following volumes:

Volume I 2004 LRDP Draft EIR
Volume II 2004 LRDP EIR technical appendices
Volume III Project EIRs for:
   Hopkins Parking Structure
   San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion
   Rady School of Management

Environmental Review and Comment: The University of California is the Lead Agency and has prepared the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of development projected in the 2004 LRDP. The 2004 LRDP Draft EIR is now available for public review.

On August 1, 2003 a Notice of Preparation was prepared and a public scoping meeting held on August 27, 2003. The 30-day public scoping period concluded on September 4, 2003. On December 5, 2003 a revised Notice of Preparation was prepared to add the Hopkins Parking Structure, San Diego Supercomputer Center Expansion, and Rady School of Management projects to the EIR. This revised Notice of Preparation provided an additional 30-day public scoping period on the 2004 LRDP and the three specific projects. A second public scoping meeting was held on December 18, 2003 and the public scoping period ended January 6, 2004.

The 2004 LRDP Draft EIR is available for review during normal operating hours at the following locations:

UCSD Geisel Library
Social Sciences and Humanities Library Reference Desk
9500 Gilman Dr 0175R
La Jolla, CA 92093-0175
http://govinfo.ucsd.edu/

San Diego City Library
820 E Street
San Diego, CA 92101-6478
Phone: 619-236-5800

San Diego City Library - La Jolla Branch
7555 Draper Avenue
San Diego, CA 92037-4802
Phone: 858-552-1657

San Diego City Library - University Community Branch
4155 Governor Dr
San Diego, CA 92122-2501
Phone: 858-552-1655

UCSD Physical Planning Office
10280 Torrey Pines Center South, Suite 340
La Jolla, CA 92039-0965
Phone: 858-534-6515
The 2004 LRDP Draft EIR is also available for review and comment online. The 2004 LRDP EIR is located at: http://physicalplanning.ucsd.edu/LRDP2004/EIR/. A CD-Rom of the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR is available from the UCSD Physical Planning Office. Please contact Darlene Newell at 858-534-6515 or djnewell@ucsd.edu. The LRDP, EIR and reference materials used in the preparation of this EIR may be reviewed during normal operating hours at the UCSD Physical Planning Office. Please contact Ms. Newell to make an appointment.

We expect the public review period will extend from May 26 through July 9, 2004. A public hearing on the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR is scheduled on campus in June, as follows:

Monday, June 14, 2004 from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.
UCSD Chancellors Complex, Room 111A

Comments on the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR can be provided online or can be mailed to:

Jeffrey A. Steindorf
UCSD Campus Planning
9500 Gilman Drive, MC 0965
La Jolla, CA 92030-0965

We have enclosed an electronic copy of the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR for your convenience. All comments must be received by 5 p.m. on July 9, 2004. Should you have any questions, please contact Catherine Presmyk at 858-534-3860. Your prompt review and acknowledgement of the 2004 LRDP Draft EIR is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey A. Steindorf
Assistant Vice Chancellor Campus Planning

Encl: 1 copy 2004 LRDP Draft EIR (CD-Rom)
Project Location Map
Affidavit of Publication

9500 GILMAN DR., #0916
SAN DIEGO, CA 92093-0916
ATTN: HOLLI LAGRAND

STATE OF CALIFORNIA} ss.
County of San Diego

The Undersigned, declares under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California: That... She is a resident of the County of San Diego.

The San Diego Union-Tribune

a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published daily in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, and which newspaper is published for the dissemination of local news and intelligence of a general character, and which newspaper at all the times herein mentioned had and still has a bona fide subscription list of paying subscribers, and which newspaper has been established, printed and published at regular intervals in the said City of San Diego, County of San Diego, for a period exceeding one year next preceding the date of publication of the notice hereinafter referred to, and which newspaper is not devoted to nor published for the interests, entertainment or instruction of a particular class, profession, trade, calling, race, or denomination, or any number of same; that the notice of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following date, to-wit: MAY 29, 2004

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Chief Clerk for the Publisher
Thursday, July 29, 2004

Darlene Newell
Physical Planning
0965


Best regards,

Noelle Chartier
Business Manager
UCSD Guardian
May 26, 2004

Media Contact: Pat JaCoby, 858-534-6404 or pjacoby@ucsd.edu
Dolores Davies, 858-534-5994 or ddavies@ucsd.edu

UCSD UPDATES LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, INVITES PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

The 2004 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the University of California, San Diego—a plan for the physical development of the campus through 2020-21—will be released today for public review and comment.

During the 45-day public review period, which will end on July 9, the documents will be available for review on UCSD’s LRDP web site at: http://physicalplanning.ucsd.edu/lrdp2004/, as well as at San Diego’s main downtown Library, the La Jolla and University City branch libraries and UCSD’s Geisel Library. A public hearing to receive comments on the DEIR will be held June 14 from 6-8 p.m. in Conference Room 111A, University Center, on the UCSD campus. Information about the plan was also presented earlier this month to several La Jolla and University City community groups.

The 2004 plan, UCSD’s fifth comprehensive LRDP, maintains the land use objectives that have been consistently reflected in plans for the campus since its inception in 1960. The current LRDP, adopted in 1989, was proposed to guide growth through 2005-06; it called for an enrollment of 26,050 students and facilities comprising about 16 million gross square feet (GSF). In comparison, UCSD’s enrollment in 2003-04 totaled 24,160 students and its facilities provided about 10 million GSF of space.

The 2004 LRDP identifies academic and student life goals, delineates campus land uses, and estimates the campus building capacity. The 2004 LRDP lays out a plan to accommodate approximately 29,900 UCSD students by 2020-21 (a 15 percent increase above the total indicated in the 1989 plan); to increase academic, housing and support
space to approximately 19 million GSF (a 20 percent increase above the total indicated in
the 1989 plan), and to develop additional on-campus parking and alternative
transportation options.

The UCSD campus comprises three distinct land areas: the properties west and
east of Interstate 5 and the Scripps Institution of Oceanography along the coast. Under
the proposed 2004 LRDP:

- the campus land west of Interstate 5 would continue to be developed with
  academic, housing, mixed use, and sports, recreation and general services
  uses;
- the east campus property east of Interstate 5 would continue to be
developed with a medical, academic/science research park,
  academic/community-oriented housing, sports and recreation land uses;
- the Scripps Institution of Oceanography campus would continue to be
developed with academic, academic/community-oriented and housing
  uses.

The majority of natural and open-space areas, known as the UCSD Park, would
remain undeveloped under the 2004 LRDP.

“In updating our long term blueprint for future growth, we are refining our land
use objectives in a manner that is consistent with our founder’s vision, and we believe
this plan will sustain UCSD’s position as a world-renowned center for higher learning,
research, medical and community facilities,” noted John Woods, vice chancellor for
Resource Management and Planning. “We are also confident that this plan will enable
UCSD to manage its growth in an orderly, coherent fashion that will be sensitive to the
needs and interests of the surrounding community and beyond. In that spirit, we
welcome and value community feedback.”

Woods said the purpose of the LRDP is to bring UCSD’s long range planning up
to date in light of evolving changes in the demographic and educational landscape. The
LRDP also provides the campus with a framework to achieve UCSD’s program goals,
and provides the basis for future decisions concerning land uses and capital projects.

Nine factors were considered in producing the 2004 LRDP, including: academic
and non-academic program requirements; distribution of student enrollment across the
academic programs; optimum rate of student and faculty growth; appropriate ratio of
graduate students to undergraduate students; UCSD's unique characteristics in light of its
history and culture; environmental resources; need for services such as student housing,
parking, transportation, recreation, childcare and administrative support; opinions of
various campus constituencies and community stakeholders, and the needs and interests
of the surrounding community, city, state and nation.

In response to campus and community concerns regarding traffic impacts, UCSD
will continue to place a high priority on alternative transportation modes for the staff,
students, and faculty. According to Milt Phegley, campus community planner, 36% of all
UCSD commuters currently arrive on campus in some alternative mode of transportation
other than a single occupancy vehicle. UCSD's alternative transportation efforts include
a community shuttle in North University City which carries 28,000 riders a week; nine
different shuttle routes and services carrying more than 3.5 million passengers each year;
20 vanpools—the largest fleet in the county—and more than 1,100 registered carpool. In
addition, UCSD parking revenues (non-State funds) paid to the San Diego Transit Corp.
allows free bus service to provided to UCSD students, faculty and staff in the areas
around campus and as far south as Mission Beach and Clairemont. Other alternative
forms of transportation, said Phegley, include the planned extension of the San Diego
Trolley to the UCSD campus, which will reduce traffic congestion and parking demand.

The 2004 LRDP identifies 297 acres of land—on the approximately 1,150 acre
campus— for new development or redevelopment, enough to accommodate the facilities
need for realizing the campus program goals. It incorporates five general development
concepts, created in the 1989 UCSD Master Plan Study, to guide the actual physical
planning processes. These include:

- **Neighborhoods**, where compact clusters of buildings and open space are used to
  break the campus into smaller college communities that have distinct boundaries
  and entries and coherent urban design.

- **University Center**, a neighborhood intended to serve as the urban “downtown” of
  the campus and a hub for academic, social and administrative activities.
- **Academic Corridors**, a conceptual planning principle to cluster related departments near one another and to provide a consistent basis for locating academic facilities in the future.

- **The Park**, encompassing UCSD’s approximate 300 acres of natural resources such as the coastal bluffs, hillsides, canyons and eucalyptus groves.

- **Connections**, the courtyards, arcades, paths, roads, public entries, landmarks, view corridors, landscape features and buildings that tie the campus together and to the community. These special public spaces preserve the human scale and distinctive attributes of the neighborhoods.

For additional information about the LRDP and DEIR or planned meetings contact Milton Phegley at 858 534-5782 or mphegley@ucsd.edu.

# # #
July 12, 2004

Catherine Presmyk  
University of California  
Physical Planning Office, UCSD  
La Jolla, CA 92093-0965

Subject: 2004 Long Range Development Plan  
SCH#: 2003081023

Dear Catherine Presmyk:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on July 9, 2004, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project’s ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

“A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specified documentation.”

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Terry Roberts  
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures  
cc: Resources Agency
SCH# 2003081023
Project Title 2004 Long Range Development Plan
Lead Agency University of California

Type EIR Draft EIR
Description The 2004 UCSD LRDP will propose general types of development and land use to support projected on-campus population growth at UCSD and to enable expanded and new program initiatives through the 2020-21 academic year. In addition, three specific projects will be analyzed in the LRDP EIR as well. These include a new 1,400 space parking structure, an 85,000 gsf building to house UCSD's new School of Management, and an 80,000 gsf addition to the existing Supercomputer Center Building.

Lead Agency Contact
Name Catherine Presmyk
Agency University of California
Phone 858-534-3860
Fax
Address Physical Planning Office, UCSD
City La Jolla
State CA Zip 92039-0965

Project Location
County San Diego
City La Jolla
Region
Cross Streets Gilman Drive and La Jolla Village Drive
Parcel No. Township 15S Range 3-4W Section 7 Base DelMar

Proximity to:
Highways SR 52 and I-5
Airports MCAS Miramar
Railways N. County Transit District
Waterways
Schools San Diego Unified, La Jolla Country Day
Land Use Academic, Academic/Community-Oriented, Academic/Science Research Park, Administrative, General Sciences, Housing, Medical, Mixed Use Park, Sports and Recreation Surface Parking.

Project Issues Aesthetic/Visual; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Coastal Zone; Drainage/Absorption; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Geologic/Seismic; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Wildlife; Cumulative Effects; Growth Inducing; Landuse

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; California Coastal Commission; Department of Conservation; Department of Fish and Game, Region 5; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Caltrans, District 11; California Highway Patrol; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 9; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission; Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics

Date Received 05/26/2004 Start of Review 05/26/2004 End of Review 07/09/2004

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.