

APPENDIX B

NOP TRANSCRIPT

**University Community Plan Amendment
Notice of Preparation
Meeting
12/16/15**

Ms. Morrison: Okay. Good evening and thank you for coming to the environmental impact report public meeting for the university community plan amendment. My name is Susan Morrison and I am an environmental planner with the City of San Diego Planning Department. These communities are referred to as EIR scoping meeting and are the purpose of helping to define the scope of work for the EIR. This meeting is required by the California Environmental Quality Act or CEQA for a project which may have statewide, regional or area wide environmental impact. The city's environmental review staff has determined that this project meets this threshold and whereby scheduled this meeting to gather public input prior to the preparation of the project's environmental document.

Environmental review staff are required by the city's municipal code to provide the public and decision makers to independently prepare environmental documents which disclose impacts to the physical environment. This information is used by decision makers as part of the deliberative process in approving or denying a project. The environmental document does not recommend approval or denial, but has provided this information on the environmental impact of a project. Now, a few comments about how the meeting will be conducted followed by a presentation of the project by the city planning staff. At the end of the meeting, time permitting, the public is welcome to ask any additional questions for clarification, however, these will not become part of the scoping into the record.

This meeting is designed to get as much public input as possible in areas that need to be addressed in the EIR in the time allotted for this meeting. Therefore, each speaker is asked to introduce themselves, state their address and complete their comments within two minutes. The entire meeting is scheduled to last two hours and will end at 8:00 p.m. Unless no further comments by the public are made, then we may end early if everyone is fine with that. The addition to verbal comments, which are being taped for the record, there are 400 available from city staff upon which they can provide written comments. We will need to have you come in or submit it to city staff by the close of the meeting or you can mail the complete form with your comments to the address listed on the back page.

It's a trifold form, so all you have to do is hold it, stamp it, seal it and then you can just mail it to me. Please remember to put your name and address on the sign-in sheet before you leave the meeting if you would like to receive a notice of availability for the draft EIR and those are located outside the door where you came in. Please refrain from conducting a debate on the merits of the project at this meeting as this is not the purpose for tonight's gathering. Rather, please focus your comments on those environmental impacts we'd like thoroughly analyzed in the project's EIR documents. Lastly, we will be acting as moderators and timekeepers for the duration of the meeting and therefore, would respectfully request that you yield when notified that your two minutes are up.

This meeting is being conducted in accordance with CEQA, the university community plan amendment on Wednesday, December 16, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. And now the project's setting, the project of the amendment of the university community plan. The university community planning area encompasses approximately 8,500 acres and is bound by Los Penasquitos Lagoon and the east-facing slopes of Sorrento Valley on the north, the tracks of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad, MCAS Miramar and I-805 on the east, State Route 52 on the south, I-5, Gilman Drive, North Torrey Pines Road, La Jolla Farms Road and the Pacific Ocean on the west. Neighboring communities include Torrey Pines, Mira Mesa, Clairemont and La Jolla. The planning area contains two state-controlled properties, UCSD and Torrey Pines State Reserve, which lie outside the zoning jurisdiction of the city.

Thank you for your patience. I am now turning the microphone over to Dan Monroe, Senior Planner for the City of San Diego Planning Department who will provide some additional information on the community plan amendment. Once Dan's presentation is complete, I will come back up briefly and then let the public speak.

Mr. Monroe: Thank you, Susan. Again, my name is Dan Monroe, planner with my department and I'm just going to kind of provide a brief overview of how the process started and some additional information. As many of you may know, the last comprehensive update to the community plan was approved back in 1987. Since that time, nearly 40 years, there's been numerous plan amendments which have occurred. They either changed land uses in and/or increased density of use. Along with that, UCSD has grown and will continue to grow into the continual future. There's been numerous changes to land use and transit in and around the community.

Some of the projects that have been planned and implemented or are going to be coming online in the near future include the North Coast Corridor Project that's along Interstate 5 and the rail lines. There's some improvements that are going to be occurring there. There's improvements to Interstate 805. As you've seen, the SuperLoop Bus Rapid Transit, which is the intercommunity shuttle loop. That's been in operation now for quite a while. So that's something that wasn't anticipated in the original 1987 plan. In addition, the extension of the light rail trolley from Old Town up into University City. It's going to be coming online, it's been approved and it's in the design phases, but that would be the extension from Old Town up through UCSD and terminating at Westfield University Town Center along Genesee Avenue.

So in that 40 years, the community has changed. The character scene has changed. It's going to continue to grow and need to take another look at the transportation facilities that are going to be serving the community and whether or not all the current improvements identified in the plan are needed, what are some new improvements that may be needed. And so that's really the purpose of why this amendment was started. Back in September, 2014, the city council initiated this amendment to the community plan. In the City of San Diego, that's the first step to this process is initiating an amendment, which is done by planning commission and/or the city council. So in this case, the city council initiated this amendment with the purpose to analyze and update the transportation facilities needed or that serve the community for both existing and future development.

We have the North University City as well as South University City public facilities financing plans and they would be amended as needed to reflect any changes that occur out of the community plan amendment and additionally, as part of this, we want to consider what the impacts would be if we removed two of the three last major transportation projects in the community, which are the Regents Road Bridge as well as the widening of Genesee Avenue. So going to the project description, next slide, please, it's supposed to be talking about one of the main components of the project is looking at what impacts would occur if these two projects were removed from the community plan as well as the facilities financing plans. The next portion of the project would be looking at implementation of general plan goals.

As you may be aware, the general plan was updated back in 2008 and there's a whole new strategy for mobility for communities as well as the city to develop a strategy. So we want to make sure that this amendment implements those strategies given that the last update was back in 1987. So that's going to be a component of this amendment. Another component is looking to update the transportation element to address what I mentioned earlier. There's a lot of planned transit improvements coming online. There's some that are already online. So we want to make sure that we account for those and what impacts those would have to circulation in the community. UCSD, as I mentioned before, because they're expanding and competing to expand, they're doing improvements as well throughout the community.

So we want to make sure those have all been accounted for and what kind of impacts those may have on circulation and then also, analyze the needs with the remaining transportation improvements identified in the current community plan. The last component would be to update the North University City public facilities financing plan as well as the South University City public facilities summary. If we identify new improvements, delete certain improvements, we want to make sure that those implementing facilities plans match our community plan amendments. So that's going to be part of the process as well. So that's the brief overview of the project description. I'll go ahead and turn it back over to Susan to continue on with the presentation.

Susan Morrison: Thank you, Dan. The actions noted above with the proposed amendments form the project analyzed in this EIR. This EIR analyzes the impacts related to removing the Genesee widening and Regents Road Bridge projects from the University Community Plan or UCP Transportation Element as well as five project alternatives, which consist of variations of including and removing the Genesee Avenue widening and the Regents Road Bridge project. The Genesee Avenue widening project would expand this roadway from four to six lanes between State Route 52 and Nobel Drive. The Regents Road Bridge project would construct two separate parallel two-lane bridge structures across Rose Canyon to connect present north and south Regents Road termini on either side of the canyon.

The second alternative would analyze the impact associated with including the Genesee Avenue widening and the Regents Road Bridge project in the UCP for future implementation. This alternative is also known as the No Project alternative. The third alternative would analyze the impacts associated with including the Genesee Avenue widening project and removing the Regents Road Bridge project from the UCP. The fourth alternative would analyze the impacts associated with including the Regents Road Bridge project and removing the Genesee Avenue

widening project from the UCP. The fifth and sixth alternatives would analyze the impacts of including a bridge extending over Rose Canyon for emergency access, transit, pedestrian and bicycle use only and include a with and without Genesee Avenue widening project scenario, respectively.

Now, I'd like to invite the public to speak. Again, please focus your comments on those environmental impacts you would like thoroughly analyzed in the project environmental documents. We will not be answering questions tonight, but simply noting and recording your comments on potential environmental impacts to the community as a result of the project. We'll ask that you please come up so we can get you on the recorder and please be sure to state your name and address before commenting. And I guess we'll go by a show of hands.

Mr. Speed: Hello. Everybody hear me? My name is Austin Speed. I live at 7110 Cather Court here in University City. I've been here since 1982. I'm here to comment on some of the structure of the NLP and the scope of work, which I think could be confusing to a potential environmental impact studying contractor, particularly the definition of a project. And if you could bring up the project alternatives that you had, that might help this comment a little bit. CEQA guidelines, which we're calling CEQA here define a project as some activity that could have an impact on the environment. Doing nothing doesn't have an impact on the environment. Therefore, removing the bridge or removing widening or removing both will have no impact on the environment. I don't think we should burden an environmental impact contractor --

[audio disturbance]

Melissa Garcia: I'm going to have you move all the way over here.

Mr. Speed: I don't think we should burden an environmental impact contractor with studying what the impact is doing nothing in. I think they should only be studying the proposed projects on the slate, which would be the bridge or the widening or both. And then this additional bridge that we're talking about here, I don't know what the genesis of that is, I hadn't heard of that until I saw [inaudible].

Ms. Rodolico: My name is Katie Rodolico. I live on 5906 Dirac and I grew up in University City, [inaudible] family and UC High. I'm a long-time community member. I had a couple questions. The UC cluster of schools recently redid the boundaries and now [inaudible] is overloaded and their [inaudible] and they're growing [inaudible]. So now, a lot of people who live in the north side of our canyon will be sending their elementary school-aged kids to [inaudible]. A bridge would potentially make it possible for people to walk to school. They can't really walk on Genesee, it's far too dangerous and too steep.

So I'd like to see that impact considered in the environmental impact report. The other question I had, and I know you weren't answering questions tonight, but it sounds great to widen Genesee and take the center divide, but the intersection of Genesee and Governor there is no extra space whatsoever to add two more lanes and I just have no idea in how that could possibly be handled.

Mr. Hekman: First, my background, I've seen an awful lot of EIRs in my history and having this public review over the holidays for 30 days [inaudible] is [inaudible]. It ought to be [inaudible]. [applause]

[inaudible] over here, all the offices are closed. This EIR should contain all current ongoing plans [inaudible] developments by assets [inaudible] in the area here and to include the present [inaudible] University of California development, I talked to these people [inaudible] over there. There's a new medical center and the associated 2,000 space parking structures are scheduled to open in spring, 2016. They're already doing business over there, but all [inaudible]. The project manager over there is very upset about the fact that his transportation plan is awry and [inaudible] GBS and up against the barriers [inaudible].

EIR should also include a completed expansion of strips, which they did a lot of exemptions on the EIR [inaudible] and their own study has \$9,000 to \$12,000 additional auto trips per day, because there's a clinic now at the head of Regents Road. It analyzed using the City of San Diego's traffic study impact [inaudible] the current version and the CEQA significant thresholds for this study, which I understand is not planned at this time even though that's part of the requirements for EIR. EIR is considering the removal of any particular project that is based upon an existing an approved EIR and the project is funded and approved for construction and removing that certainly has to be a complete EIR, because it's a private [inaudible]. Thank you very much.

Mr. Monroe: Could we get your name?

Mr. Hekman: Yeah. Pete Hekman, H-e-k-m-a-n, the first name is Peter.

Ms. Morrison: And just state it for the record.

Mr. Hekman: Yeah. Peter Hekman and I am a resident of the University City south side.

Mr. Monroe: Thank you.

Ms. Kruger: Hi. My name is Janay Kruger. I live at 4013 Porte de Palmas, number 53. I [inaudible] San Diego [inaudible] too and I am [inaudible] with the planning group. So [inaudible] is everybody in this room cares a great deal about the community and circulation and density and everything. We have a project in the community that has not been approved yet, they're not entitled and particularly one which is the Costa Verde project is proposing to add 200 [inaudible] and over 100,000 square feet of retail. And so we are [inaudible] pressure testing at each of the separate traffic run without the Costa Verde project. So there would be one more alternative, because we're worried about Genesee, we don't want to widen it.

And so we'd like one more traffic run without the Costa Verde. We feel this community is at a tipping point for traffic and that we really can't handle any more density traffic issues. So we'd really appreciate that. Thank you.

Ms. Garcia: Come on up.

Ms. Connor: I just found out today, this afternoon, that you're having this meeting. So I kind of wrote it up pretty much.

Ms. Morrison: Go ahead and state your name first.

Ms. Tana: My name is Alice Tana and I live at 3114 East Fox Run Way, San Diego, 92111, which is Clairemont. Anything that happens in University City happens in Clairemont also. I see a lot of you shaking your head. I mean, my office is on La Jolla Village Drive. And so when I'm heading home at night, it takes me anywhere from 50 minutes to an hour to go from here to where I live off of Boyd. At that end, we have UCSD traffic going that way. At that end, we have [inaudible] traffic going this way. So it's like a circus every day. There's a lot of accidents because of it. There's kids flying down the road to go to Mesa College and kids flying up the road to go to UCSD.

Something's got to be done [inaudible]. [inaudible] assistant [inaudible]. 805 is still at a standstill out there. I-8 is at a standstill until almost 10:00 o'clock and over there, sometimes it's 8:00 or 9:00 o'clock on 805, same thing in the morning. It starts at 6:15 or 6:30 a.m. and it ends anywhere from 9:30 to 10:00. These ladies are shaking their heads, they know. And so it's a real problem and I hope you consider that. You need more Clairemont [inaudible] understands out there. They don't know any of this, just those two lanes there and those [inaudible] and something's got to be done. And the money is in escrow, so we've got to go forward. Thank you very much.

Mr. Rodolico: Good evening. My name is Lewis Rodolico. I live at 5906 Dirac Street. I believe the Regents Bridge building, because it would help to desegregate our community in North UC and South UC now have a iron horse separating it. There's really only one legal pedestrian traffic and bicycle passage between the north and south. We could also, like you say, [inaudible] our community by adding both roads in, because now Genesee [inaudible] traffic on it also segregates our community. I recognize the various officials requesting that there be at least one legal crossing within those canyons. Right now, there's a very dangerous turning [inaudible] curve.

I'd like to see at least one legal train crossing. My [inaudible] has to do with the danger of forming all traffic through one intersection and how that would be [inaudible], no matter how you look at it, decreases the accident and death and injury rate in our community. It's simple common sense that both bridges need to go in. We've already lost the Governor/Gilman connection. There were three north/south lane roads between Southern UC and Northern UC. We've already lost one, we're talking about getting rid of the second and leaving us with one. If they're claiming to even take one out, it's horrible planning to consider two. Thank you.

Ms. Morrison: Thank you. [applause]

Ms. Plumb: My name is Shelley Plumb, 5952 Scripps Street, University City. Yesterday at the city hall, the city council unanimously voted in a climate action plan for San Diego and to put a new roadway in just doesn't make sense. We have to -- you know, there's going to be changes in the way that transportation is done. So putting a bridge in at a huge expense doesn't make sense.

All the traffic is on Genesee. If something has to be done, it should be done at Genesee. Thank you. [applause]

Mr. Larson: Thank you. My name is Jim Larson [ph] and I lived at 3863 Camino Lindo since 1978. I'm not familiar with all these plans and all that, but the overview, from an environmental view, is that the city had just passed and takes great pride in an environmental act -- you called it what?

Mr. Monroe: Climate action plan.

Mr. Larson: The climate action plan. It would be in Congress to support a bridge and a road that would actually increase the number of vehicles on our streets. It doesn't compute. It would also be in direct competition with the [inaudible], because it would serve exactly the same [inaudible] and it would induce more traffic, because the principle is if you make it easier and less expensive, you're going to have more of it. So I don't know what all the alternatives are, but I think building the Regents Road Bridge and opening that up is not an environmentally sound idea. [applause]

Ms. Lin: Karen Lin, 2535 San Clemente Terrace, University City. This was like a AA meeting today. So I'm going to start with a confession. My name is Karen and I'm part of the problem. I've lived in this area 25 years and I have commuted every Monday through Friday to either Sorrento Valley or Carlsbad and guess how I do it? In my car alone. So I would love if the impact of this new climate plan that the city has that that's going to include encouraging vanpooling and carpooling, other forms of getting people out of their home by themselves, because as much as I hate traffic and I hate my commute, and it's bad and I agree with what all of you are saying is bad, I'd hate to see [inaudible] canyon to make my commute a couple minutes shorter.

I'd rather find a way to fit another person in my car or get to [inaudible] easier or [inaudible] my job easier. I would love for the planning in the city and everybody [inaudible] that. [applause]

Ms. Pelling: Hi. I'm Elizabeth Pelling and I live at 2828 [inaudible] Avenue in University City since 1973, raised a son here and one of the great joys of my life is the open spaces that is still available to us. Rose Canyon is a precious space that we must preserve. There's nothing that I believe about San Diego or California if you build a road, it will fill it. Fill it, fill it, fill it, fill it. And we must now start looking at alternatives to travel. I would love to be able to get on a tram, trolley, bus, something to get to some of the places that I want to go to. So my [inaudible] is to not fill up more roads, let's keep open spaces available, beautiful, previous places for our children and we can recreate and still breathing oxygen from the plants instead of the nitrogen from the cars. Thank you. [applause]

Ms. Speer: Hi. I'm Phyllis Speer. I live at 5978 Karensue Lane for about 31 years and I'm here to speak on behalf of the people who are impacted by all the [inaudible] today. There's a lot of [inaudible] plans coming up for UCC. We've got [inaudible] plans that cause severity, we've got the tram coming in. We haven't had a lot of traffic out there and [inaudible] that's going on on our side of University City. I appreciate you want to bring up the property values and you'd like to appreciate Rose Canyon. I'm sure there's a way to protect Rose Canyon if we build a bridge.

It's part of the plan, it was always planned for our community to complete it. So I really want to speak for building the bridge and completing our community and giving a bridge to the people who are impacted by the traffic on Genesee. Thank you. [applause]

Ms. Kuczenski: Hi. My name is Mona Kuczenski and I'm a resident of University City. So I just wanted to echo the comment earlier that I think the review period is really unfortunate to have a 30-day review period be coinciding with the month of December. I just feel it's not very respectful of the residents and giving people an opportunity to participate, regardless of their position. I respect people's positions on both sides and I would like an opportunity to get more information and be able to have a robust public participation process and I just feel that it's very disrespectful to have it during -- if you didn't have to have it during the month of December, at least extend it into January.

Having it conclude on January 1st, I just don't understand it and I don't understand what the rush is. These plans have been on the books for decades and what's it going to hurt to give people a chance to really participate in the process. I'm also a little bit disappointed by an accompanying NOP is the scope of work. I find it to be very generic, an all-purpose kind of fill in the blank for the project name. It didn't have very much detail about the proposed project or the alternatives that are listed, but there's not very much information about the environmental considerations that are being looked at by the EIR team and I think it would be really helpful at this stage of the process if it was an initial study instead of a scope of work so that people really had something to respond to in terms of giving input about the issues that should be addressed in the EIR.

So I hope that you will take those comments under consideration and give us a little bit more time and a little bit more information and make sure that everybody gets a chance to participate. Thank you. [applause]

Ms. Pietras: Carole Pietras, I've lived at 6917 Lipmann Street since 1971 and I would like to echo the previous speaker's comments about the scoping period. I think to have this -- today is December 16th. Many people here are celebrating Christmas, have celebrated Hanukah, are celebrating other holiday activities and I think it really is unfortunate and unfair and I voiced this at the UCP meeting on November 10th when it was first announced. And we've had this project for so many years and perhaps, Councilwoman Lightner could explain why it's so important to have this during this period.

Most agencies, most associations do not meet in December. Why are we expected to be able to comment before January 1st? It really is an insult to the community. And this is not just a District 1 situation. People from Clairemont also come up Genesee. You have people in the community who don't drive on the freeways, who have to get to the medical offices, go for their treatments and when Genesee is down, they are forced to go on the freeways and they shouldn't necessarily have to do that to get from one end of the community to the other. Today, there was a seven-car accident on Genesee at Appleton, this is going south.

Somebody had posted a notice on Nextdoor, don't go south on Genesee into Clairemont, you're going to be backed up. A few weeks ago, there was an accident there, or maybe it was a month ago, same spot. Prior to that, another accident, same spot. We had an accident in front of the high

school, not involving students, a serious injury accident that closed Genesee northbound and southbound for three hours. So everybody loves open space, but for heaven's sake, a bridge doesn't pave the canyon, it goes over it. And please extend the comment period. [applause]

Mr. O'Connell: Thank you. Dale O'Connell, 5274 La Jolla, 92037. I've been following this issue for quite a while and my sister-in-law lives on the edge of Rose Canyon. So she's been giving me an earful over the years. I want to speak to the purpose of the meeting tonight, which is only to flush out the issues that we want the environmental analysis to cover and not argue the issue per se. One, please make the document legally defensible. You're going to go through a lot of words. So please make it very, very [inaudible]. And today, I'm going to argue to the opposite, let's get this done so we can get it in front of city council by next November. In terms of the issues, I hope you addressed and outlined a lot of the mobility changes we're looking that have happened.

I would hope that you would include everything of the 2015 regional transportation plan, both funded and proposed plans. That really changes it and makes the mobility in the University City area. For the No Project for alternative number four and to a lesser degree, five and six, you already have a good understanding of the impacts of the open space land for modification, biology and probably a few more from the previous EIR and I would expect those issues to be fully flushed out and those impacts flushed out about why those alternatives are not the environmentally superior one. In addition, I would like to make sure that you incorporate -- I'm going to go blank right now, but make sure that we really understand what the impacts of the Genesee widening are.

Somebody else mentioned about the climate action plan, the greenhouse gases that the city has committed to. Keep a tight rein on your traffic engineer who are still proposing street widening in the urban parts of our city where clearly, that's not the policy and direction of our city, especially in terms of complete streets. And so just do a great job. Honestly, everybody really cares about this. Be thorough in your analysis of every alternative and on every issue. Thank you. [applause]

Mr. Cavanaugh: My name is Roger Cavanaugh and I'm a psychologist and my wife and I have lived in University Woods for 32 years. I want to start with the idea of what working environment is. We go on arbitrary [inaudible] between the human and the natural world. I think we need to include the human habitat as part of the environment. I'm particularly concerned with the welfare of children. I can find over 900 reasons to say no to the bridge. They all go to [inaudible] school. I live in this neighborhood, walk in it, I know the congestion of traffic. [inaudible] relatively high speed commuter traffic down Regents from that bridge runs it right into the school, park and community center.

That's really, really counterproductive, it's not safe, it's destructive on many levels. Recent studies have shown cognitive development of children is compromised by pollution, especially automobile exhaust. And so if we're going to pile the automobile exhaust right in our schools, it's just another way in which we're not really thinking about where our priorities are. My priority is the welfare of those children. Having lived in the neighborhood as a psychologist doing work with kids, I feel that we really, really have to rethink all of our decisions in a fundamental way and look at the human costs of what we're doing as part of the environmental costs. I have a lot

more to say about it, but other people want to speak. So just open your heart a little bit to the welfare of our children and I think where we know where we're going on this issue. [applause]

Mr. Mathis: Thank you very much. I'm Harry Mathis. I want to speak to a number of issues on the NOP, but the gentleman who just spoke, I would just recommend that he go and talk to the children that are attending the three schools on Genesee, the high school, elementary school and the middle school that are all adjacent to the intersection of Genesee and Governor and they need some relief and they look for relief at Regents Road. One of the things that I wanted to ask, and I know you're not answering any questions, but I think it's a pertinent question is that that elimination of the Regents Road Bridge and the widening of Genesee is called the preferred project.

And what connotation does that have in terms of being able to judge in the EIR the relationship of those two projects to the other alternatives? Does it pre-permit the focus of the EIR to giving the preferred project a special status in terms of your evaluation? I think that's a legitimate question. One has to ask, what set of circumstances would have to be shown to permit one to conclude that the bridge should be built given the burden of that particular designation? The bridge is described in the NOP as two separate one-way stance. We've seen some designs in the past. That's the first one that I've seen here.

What's the rationale for choosing that as the specific design? Is it specific to increase the cross of the bridge? That does increase the footprint in the canyon floor. So that is a question that needs to be answered up front. The scope of the analysis sometimes appears to be constrained within the boundaries of the community plan. The bridge is not an internal project, it's a gateway project and all the impacts have to be judged in terms of not only internal, but external and the adjacent communities in how their traffic patterns and how their vehicle mile travel occur. I can tell you, we came here tonight -- I live in a place -- is that some sort of limit on speaking time?

Ms. Morrison: Yeah. Go ahead and finish your comment and your thought and then that's got to be it.

Mr. Mathis: Okay. I just want to reiterate that we came over here tonight, we've lived in a neighborhood overlooking Regents Road, the west end of University City for 35 years. I've got a lot of history with this project as I think a number of people in this audience know. And coming over here, we had to go down to the freeway, try and come over on the [inaudible] to get here and we couldn't get across Genesee, because the cars were so backed up they were blocking the intersection. We had to sit through three different light changes before we could get through. If anybody thinks that we don't have traffic problems on Genesee, they've got another thing coming, just try that one.

My point is that if we had to travel out of that way and add a number of vehicle miles, just think, it should be analyzed as how many vehicle miles are traveled with the additional pollution for people to get out of Clairemont or out of University City that can't use Genesee and have to go around using the freeways. And I can tell you, from my personal experience, those freeways are blocked.

Female: Time.

Mr. Mathis: Okay. I have my comments in writing. I'm going to give them to you. But they're serious questions here.

Female: Time.

Mr. Mathis: Who's yelling time? Debbie, are you yelling time?

Ms. Morrison: Go ahead. Are you going to come up? Oh, you're here. Come on up closer to the microphone.

Ms. Holloway: Hi. My name is Nancy Holloway [ph]. I live on Mercer Lane in University City, have lived there for a long time. I just want to thank all that you guys are doing. We need to reserve the open space, it's very valuable. Once it's gone, we can't get it back. And I also want to say, in response to the man who was just up here, that I had to leave my home late, because I had another meeting, we left at 6:10, I live close to Flynn Park, we got here in 10 minutes. It is not always bad. [applause]

And if you ever have been to any other large city, you always know there are traffic issues to deal with. That is the price of living in an urban environment. At another meeting that I was at, people say, I have to time my errands at certain times. That is the price of living in an urban environment. You figure out when traffic is least, do the best you can. It's a nationwide problem, maybe we have to deal with it at that level. We need transportation everywhere. It is not unique to here. The bridge isn't going to help it. [applause]

Mr. Goldstein: Thank you. I'm Paul Goldstein]. I've lived in University City for 15 years. The previous [inaudible] speaker mentioned a couple concepts that I think are misleading concepts that have been surfacing in a lot of the conversation repeatedly over the many years we've talked about this particular topic. One is the idea of a footprint and no environmentalist, no person concerned with public programs at all would consider the footprint to be, in any way, equivalent or even proportional to the impact of any project. So that's a hellacious argument to talk about the size of the footprint and talk about the size of the piling or a [inaudible], which I've seen that surface repeatedly and it's really a false premise.

So it's good to have an open debate, but we have to start with true premises, not false premises. Another false premise that I just want to touch on quickly is this concept of relief that the gentleman mentioned as well. A gateway project to open gateways to provide relief in a traffic sense has never been proven to be something that naturally works. To provide more roads is not a way of reducing traffic. Providing more roads creates more traffic. That seems to be a fairly simple, logical premise. The reverse of it is certainly not provable. So the idea that creating additional roads will somehow reduce traffic rather than invite traffic is like saying that adding additional panels will have lower water in a drainage system.

The water will find the routes just like the traffic will find the routes. So adding additional highways through a residential neighborhood will create impacts throughout the residential

neighborhood that are far worse than any kind of relief that we can imagine coming from that project. [applause]

Mr. Paul: Hello there. My name is Billy Paul. I live in Clairemont and I do a lot of work at the Rose Creek Estuary and I've talked to the ducks there and they have asked me to come here to tell you a few words.

[laughter]

Well, for those of you who don't understand duck talk, what they're trying to tell you is please don't build the bridge there. We don't want our little ducklings, when they learn to fly, to get hit by cars and have problems, because the learning curve is that when you learn the danger of a car, you're dead and dead ducks don't fly anymore. So on behalf of the ducks at Rose Creek and all the wildlife that are there, please do not build the bridge and you don't need the bridge. Now, I've seen the fire map and this horrendous fire that runs down Marian Bear Park and then comes into your community and burns it up. Well, what can you do to stop that?

Well, let's do a lower cost solution. Rather than running away from the fire, let's put fire hydrants on both sides of 52 so when the fire comes down the canyon, rather than the fire trucks only having the load of water they can carry will have high pressure fire hydrants right there where you can hook up and will squirt that water down on the fire and will stomp the fire before it gets down the canyon and you will no longer have to leave your house. You will no longer need to use the road to get away. You will save the canyon, you will save your house and you'll also save the ducks. Thank you. [applause]

Ms. Zirk: Hi. My name is Karin Zirk and I live at 2686 Hornblend Street in Pacific Beach. I work at 5200 Illumina Way here in University City, which is that big building right across the street from this recreation center. I commute from PB here taking a combination of freeways and surface streets. If I time it right, it's a 15 to 20-minute drive. If I don't time it right, I can go at peak time for 30 minutes. But I'm here to talk about the regional nature of the environmental impact report. Specifically, I want to be said in the EIR the impacts to Rose Creek in Rose Canyon and also to the downstream portions, which go into Mission Bay Park and the water quality impacts that may occur in Mission Bay Park for the proposed alternative.

Keep in mind that Genesee widening will also impact the lower portion of Rose Creek, because that's leads into San Clemente Creek through Marian Bear Park. So we should also be studying the water quality impacts there. I'm also asking for the environmental impact reports to study the impact to the MSCPA area, which was set aside for development in this area. It was a very revolutionary concept when it first came up and I don't believe the intention was to degrade the park in any way with transportation options. So I think we should look at what potential impacts would occur in Rose Canyon or all three alternatives. If we determine there are any type of negative impacts to Rose Canyon, I'd like the study to show how mitigation can happen for coastal space for our habitat within the coastal area of the City of San Diego.

Finally, there are two major regional projects happening in Mission Bay Park that will be negatively impacted by water quality reduction, the De Anza revitalization plan and the ReWild Mission Bay project. Thank you. [applause]

Ms. Garcia: Come on up.

Ms. Knight: Thank you. My name is Debbie Knight. I live at 6804 Fisk Avenue. I live very close to the Governor/Genesee intersection, so I interact with it, often multiple times a day. I'm very familiar with that intersection. And I'm going to actually read my comments so I get through this quickly. So Friends of Rose Canyon strongly supports the city's decision to initiate proceedings to remove the environmentally damaging cross street and unnecessary Regents Road Bridge project from the community plan. This is an antiquated road project designed in another time not appropriate to our conditions today.

And assuming that it's done, we also strongly support removing the widening of Genesee. First, I think it will be really important the draft EIR include a clear statement of objectives for the plan amendment. Clear objectives are very important as the underlying purpose of the plan amendment is to remove the bridge and Genesee widening from the community plan, that the alternative under consideration consists of projects that are diametrically at odds with the project itself, i.e., some variations of building the Regents Road Bridge project or Genesee. And we recommend the EIR include objectives that call for University City to promote a sustainable and multimodal approach to transportation, a multimodal transportation system meets the needs of all users, including those riding public transit, bicyclists and pedestrians.

And I would emphasize it's really important that it looks at both sides of Rose Canyon, because North University City, although people who live there don't call it that, is exactly what is described in where the city says it wants to be going, it's high density, there's a lot of transit riders, there's a lot of walkers and that's exactly the type of community that we don't want to drive a new road through or expand on this road. Also, it strikes me this will be an unusual EIR and that the project itself will likely have beneficial impacts in many impact areas, including biological resources, water quality, visual resources, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions and noise.

A project that protects the environment is to be celebrated. We encourage the city to call attention to these beneficial environmental impacts in the draft EIR. Thank you. [applause]

Ms. Kay: Hello. My name is Isabelle Kay. I reside at 3163A Evening Way in La Jolla and I go through the Genesee/Governor/Regents area all the time, because we're all connected. I manage the Kendall-Frost Marsh in Mission Bay and such, which is part of the University of California's natural reserve system and as such, I would like to commend the previous speakers on pointing out the downstream impacts if one is put in, the Genesee widening or the bridge and to definitely consider the cumulative impact on Rose Canyon and therefore, the downstream areas.

We already have the double tracking project, we're going to have the [inaudible] project and we've just gone through the water quality improvement planning process and you'd want to make sure that the analysis includes anything that's not in concurrence with the recommendations of

that long, drawn out process that should have a really good outcome. And of course, considering wildlife impact, both direct and indirect, motion light and pollutant impacts on wildlife and archeological impacts as well. And it would be great to consider, in the plan, safe access to Rose Canyon Open Space for the community at large. Thank you. [applause]

Ms. Garcia: Come on up.

Mr. Martin: My name is Glenn Martin. I live on [inaudible] and I was born and raised in University City. The environmental impact report should contain a listing of all the current amount of permitted development in University City by asset type to clarify the amount of commercial, retail, medical, industrial, hospital and residential space currently developed along with the daily trips estimated by each how to calculate and outlined in the City of San Diego's trip generation manual. This would demonstrate the current volume of employees, staff, building visitors as well as residents in the area. I think it's imperative to have this information clearly stated in the EIR so [inaudible] see all those [inaudible] and those that live in the area.

To develop a plan without a thorough understanding or acknowledgement of these factors is improper and I'm truly baffled at the timing of this NOP and EIR scoping meeting. It's during the middle of December when the city offices themselves are closed. To have this rushed done at this time of year is just unacceptable. It would also be important to have the study of who uses the SuperLoop, if it's just UCSD students or who those patrons are. And also, as stated in the last UCPG meeting, the estimate given by MTS was that during completion, there would only be 1,700 to 1,800 passengers on the trolley for the Blue Line extending out from Old Town. Thanks.

Mr. Reich: Hi. My name is Darrell Reich [ph]. I live at 5743 Scripps Street down at Regents and 52. I work up on Campus Point, I went to UCSD, I've lived here all my life. So I'm enjoying the 5, the Genesee and the 805. So in the environmental impact report, I would work with CALTRANS on the traffic study. Somehow we have to separate the locals from the short cutters that are passing through town to avoid the freeway, because if CALTRANS fixed the freeway, then they wouldn't be on my road; right? If they took the trolley, then they wouldn't be on my road.

But I avoid the freeway, because the freeway is far. Anyways, finally, the favorite subject in San Diego is the endangered fairy shrimp. If you've read the environmental impact report for the Miramar Cemetery, that headstones are not in a straight line because of the endangered animals that are at the bottom of the food chain. They don't make clacking noises, but I think that birds eat the fairy shrimp would eat the dah, dah, dah, dah, dah. Anyways, that's going to have to be in there. So I noticed this report has the dinosaurs on the list, the 78 [inaudible] they've recently found a woolly mammoth. That will stop all construction whatsoever when you find a dinosaur in the artifacts.

[laughter]

Ms. Groves: My name is Nancy Groves. I've lived in University City since 1973 and I just had a quick comment that I think the EIR definitely is taking into account all the transportation studies, but people don't realize that in the neighborhood, that when we have the trolley and that they are

currently widening, adding more lanes to 805 already, which the last person mentioned and if we add of these and new lanes to 805, the new trolley and the improvements of all the Genesee, the new bridge going over Genesee is certainly going to take a lot of the traffic off the different parts of the city. I also think that those who are worried about fire, I heard one of the gentleman mention something that I think is a great idea, if the city would manage to change its mind about something in the purple pipes and extend them at least down to Marian Bear Park.

They already go to Governor. If they go down the hill to Marian Bear Park, then they could be useful in case there were a fire, but right now, they aren't. And I think MTS needs to look at the transportation of how people from South UC can get to North UC or to the trolley station, if there were small vans, you don't need double long buses to take three people from South UC neighborhoods up to the trolley station. But I think all of that would help if we look at all those things together. We need to get more cars off the road, not add more to it. And really, the people coming down Genesee, 90 percent of them are just passing through our neighborhoods to get to the freeway.

Do we really want all that traffic coming through Governor? Do you really want all that coming through there where your kids cross the street? Not really. They need to find a way to get them out onto the freeways faster rather than down Genesee onto 52 up to 805. Thank you. [applause]

Ms. Morrison: Looks like we have time.

Mr. Speed: Hi. I'm Austin Speed, you heard from me before. I did look at the NOP document and one of the things I noted in there is that the air quality section seems to address looking at existing data. I recommend some specific air quality tests be done in and around the schools during the congested periods so that we can determine if the air quality is substandard, because really, part of the theory here is the distribution of traffic and better flow of traffic. So that's one of the impacts I think should be looked at. And one other comment, someone mentioned that we need to get this process done by November. I see absolutely no reason to get this process done by November. We need to take the time to do this right.

Ms. Gibson: [inaudible] operations emergency services and I hear [inaudible] that someday we may have a small fire team here, but that does not alleviate the problem on fires. People come, they have to transport emergency people by ambulance to a nearby hospital and right now, that is impossible. Most of the ambulance calls do not arrive in the specified time and they can't, because Genesee [inaudible] on the way in.

Ms. Morrison: Can we go ahead and get your name for the record?

Ms. Gibson: Sorry, my name is Jane Gibson. I've lived in University City since 1965, that's 50 years and I live on Radcliffe Drive in South UC.

Ms. Morrison: Do we have another one?

Mr. Hekman: Yes. A few facts on University City. I just want to leave a little factoid with everybody. I spent a lot of time in the Philippines when Mt. Pinatubo exploded about 15 years

ago. It put more global warming gases into the atmosphere than all of humankind since the dawn of history and we have 250-some active volcanoes in the world today. Thank you. So much for the environmental plan.

Ms. Morrison: Are there any other commenters? This closes the public environmental scoping meeting for the University Community Plan Amendment. Your input will be transcribed, considered by city staff for use in the scope of the EIR and included as part of the official record for the document. Speakers and commenters will also be placed on the notification list for further environmental review actions related to this project. So please, if you haven't already signed in on the sheet, make sure that your name and either your mailing address or email address is on there so that we can contact you and provide you with notices. And again, those are located right outside the doors.

I would also like to remind everyone that this is just the start of the environmental review process and opportunities for public input. Comments received today and during the scoping process will be reviewed and considered during the EIR process. Staff and the consultant team will prepare a draft EIR, which will be distributed for a 60-day public review and the next opportunity to provide comments on the project. A final EIR with a response to comments will be distributed prior to the start of public hearings and the final opportunity for public comment on the project. And we'll put our contact information up on the screen for you. Thank you for taking the time to participate in the meeting and have a great evening. [applause]

If you haven't signed in on the sign-in sheet because it was out of space, can you please sign in on the reverse of one of the sheets? Thank you.