

**Verbatim Comments by the SDRC Governing Board Members
April 8, 2005- Item 16 (SDSU 2005 Campus Master Plan Revision, Draft
Environmental Impact Report / Proposed Adobe Falls Development)**

The following comments on the SDSU 2005 Campus Master Plan Revision, Draft Environmental Impact Report / Proposed Adobe Falls Development were made by the Governing Board Members of the San Diego River Conservancy at their public meeting on April 8, 2005 after the presentation made by Tony Fulton, Director, Office of Facilities Planning and Management, SDSU.

Dick Murphy, Chairman: Let me just start with a couple of questions. If you could explain to us the jurisdiction issue. Does the City have power over a state project?

Tony Fulton, SDSU: They do not. This action- the lead agency is the Board of Trustees at the California State University and as such is not subject to the City of San Diego's rejection or approval.

Dick Murphy, Chairman: So this will never really come to the City Council?

Tony Fulton, SDSU: No. It will not.

Dick Murphy, Chairman: Is there any possibility regarding that road along the concrete channel to take the concrete channel out as part of that road construction?

Tony Fulton, SDSU: Well that is a good question. It is a habitat question too. From what we have looked at there, the slope from the freeway runs down to the channel rather steeply and CALTRANS owns right to the edge of the channel. We have not been able to identify who the channel ownership is. Whether it is an easement to the City or from the property owners, but the slope runs right to the channel. The channel is about 45 feet wide. And then it abuts the private Smoketree and other parcels along that element. So it seems very difficult, either to bridge the channel is one possibility and leave the channel in place and leave the slope alone. Or, I doubt whether there is room to take both the channel out and restore it to some sort of a natural channel and provide a road within the right of way that is available there. There is just not enough room to get both of them in there.

Dick Murphy, Chairman: First of all, as you see, the City is trying to move to removing concrete in channels because all the concrete channels are super highways to bring polluted water to the beaches. There is no absorption in the concrete channels. We are trying to get rid of as many concrete channels as we can. But it is expensive and there are a lot of problems with doing it. We have enjoyed a little progress at least in Chollas creek and other places.

Both the Mill Peak connection and the Adobe Falls connection goes east into Del Cerro, is that correct?

Tony Fulton, SDSU: Yes. They do.

Dick Murphy, Chairman: So how much of this is Alvarado Creek flood plain that you would be proposing to build in?

Tony Fulton, SDSU: I'm not sure I get the question but, out of the 33 acres we are talking about we are developing on 20 of them. There is an additional two parcels: one of five to six acres the City owns which has been restored, and then another five acres of open space that has been dedicated by Smoketree. So out of the total area down there, we are developing twenty out of 44 maybe acres that are open space habitat that can be restored and maintained.

Dick Murphy, Chairman: Before I forget, one of the problems that we have in that area is that you come down from Lake Murray Dam and you have concrete, then you have natural, then you have concrete, then you have natural and so as you might guess, if you intermittently concrete a channel it causes some flooding problems. That is why it would be great to get rid of some of the concrete. All we do is rush that water into some of the Grantville Area which causes then flooding all of the time. Talk about not looking at cumulative impacts. Concrete little pieces of a major creek and leave others in their natural position is asking for disaster. So anyway... I need to stop. We are running out of time and I know a few people want to talk. Donna.

Donna Frye, Vice-Chair: There was a slide that you had where it has the open space and you were saying that it is owned by the City. By that I am assuming that you mean it is owned by the City of San Diego.

Tony Fulton, SDSU: Yes.

Donna Frye, Vice-Chair: So that area is mitigation area. So that is already dedicated?

Tony Fulton, SDSU: Yes

Donna Frye, Vice-Chair: So you couldn't build there if you wanted to?

Tony Fulton, SDSU: No.

Donna Frye, Vice-Chair: Because it is dedicated and it would take a vote of the public.

Tony Fulton, SDSU: That's right.

Donna Frye, Vice-Chair: The next site you say is mitigation and that is also, I am assuming, dedicated as open space.

Tony Fulton, SDSU: Yes.

Donna Frye, Vice-Chair: Ok, so that also would not be, there would be nothing you could do because it is dedicated.

Tony Fulton, SDSU: Right.

Donna Frye, Vice-Chair: And then I also believe you said part of that open space area that much of it was used was used as a mitigation site from the sewage spill. So part of it is also a mitigation area.

Tony Fulton, SDSU: That part right there. Yes.

Donna Frye, Vice-Chair: And so are you proposing then to build in part of the mitigation area.

Tony Fulton, SDSU: No.

Donna Frye, Vice-Chair: So none of that.

Tony Fulton, SDSU: No, None of that.

Donna Frye, Vice-Chair: Ok. The issue before us is to consider the adoption of the resolution authorizing the Executive Officer to prepare comprehensive comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report. And I would certainly move that item.

Dick Murphy, Chairman: Is there a second?

Jim Peugh, Board Member: So second.

Donna Frye, Vice-Chair: My concern is that in directing our Executive Director to do that it is probably impossible for her to provide those comprehensive comments to you by Monday. And so my concern is that we would be providing her with direction to do something that would not be received or considered. So I am not exactly sure. Am I accurate in that analysis?

Deborah Jayne, Executive Director: You are absolutely accurate, especially considering our tour is tomorrow.

Donna Frye, Vice-Chair: Right. So basically the situation before this board is we would very much like our Executive Director to comment on those issues that are related to the San Diego River Conservancy's enabling statutes and missions and we would very much like you to hear them. Unfortunately, that is not going to happen, even if we vote for it to happen if your acceptance of those comments is not extended beyond Monday. And so it is posing a dilemma we can certainly vote to do it but without your allowing those comments... Certainly you would be making an exception but I think it would be very important to hear what this board has to say and particularly with the open space issues

and we understand your timing concerns. But this would only be one set of comments. It wouldn't be a flood of them. Would you be willing to do that?

Tony Fulton, SDSU: If it were a comment to approve I think I could answer that recommendation very quickly. I expect an extensive set of comments. I can tell you that we have only given one extension to one agency and this is the agency we have given that extension to. So, we set that deadline only to allow us enough time to respond if the comments come in days later, I will do my best to respond to those. I understand her problem. There are a lot of river issues out there that need comment. Grantville is another one. She has spent a lot of time working on these things with a staff of one, so I understand her problems and constraints too. So I am waiting and I am really hoping to be able to incorporate those comments. I would appreciate moving to have her do that. We will try to wait as long as we can and be able to incorporate those comments.

Donna Frye, Vice-Chair: Right. Because one of the things that we would like to avoid happening, and hopefully by receiving those comments ahead of the actual action by your board, would be to look at those and be able to have some sort of response to them. As opposed to having folks show up at the final hearing possibly in opposition, possibly further slowing down your project. So that is why there is a value to that. I appreciate that very much.

Dick Murphy, Chairman: OK, folks we are running out of time here. If nobody really has anything else critical to say, I would suggest we just vote on the motion.

Jim Peugh, Board Member: I know that Deborah is going to be writing up comments. When you look at that picture, the west side, there is habitat on every single side of the project. Edge effects are very important. But I think edge effects were handled in a very cavalier manner all the way around. There is no mitigation for feral animals, even though residential uses attract feral animals. You say you are going to dump the runoff into Alvarado Creek as a mitigation measure, but there is no analysis to show that that quick load of water can be handled in Alvarado Creek in terms of capacity or velocity. That kind of analysis needs to be done, especially for a programmatic document. You talk about 25 foot habitat buffer but you don't say what species you are providing the buffer for so it's not the least bit clear. Is it for caterpillars? I don't know what 25 foot would protect. And then when you are talking about storing hazardous waste, you say you are going to things that are absolutely required by everybody else's regulation but only on an MEP basis. You should be doing those absolutely- not just if it is easy to do. So I am really concerned with the edge effects. This is just an edge effects prince's project.

Jack Minan, Board Member: I would just like to follow up with Donna's observations which I share. And that is I think our Executive Officer ought to be given a sufficient period of time within which to make a competent review and if that doesn't work out in terms of your scheduling, I would recommend that the comments be forwarded directly to the Board of Trustees so that they can have the information before them in order to make their decision. So I hope we can work cooperatively, but if that is not possible and you

are under sufficient time pressure you just can't handle it, and then I would recommend that we share the comments with the Board of Trustees.

Deborah Jayne, Executive Director: That is a good idea.

Donna Frye, Vice-Chair: I would just like to add that to the motion. But also that if necessary that the comments could also be presented orally as well as in writing if the Executive Director so chooses.

Deborah Jayne, Executive Director: OK. I just want to say real quickly that I have some serious concerns about this project, particularly as it relates to cumulative impacts. As you know, Grantville is just downstream on Alvarado Creek and these two projects need to be thoroughly assessed individually as well as together, in combination. That is what I would like the time to do.

Secondly, I would like to let you know that Dr. Hector and Bill White have also informed me that historians believe that there was a small dam and flume in that area. It was part of the irrigation system for the mission agricultural fields. So, at a minimum I would recommend you adopt the resolution that authorizes me to submit comments. I guess if I had a wish list I would ask you to adopt a resolution identical to the one you just did. Thank you.

Donna Frye, Vice-Chair: And that is included in my motion.

Dick Murphy, Chairman: OK. All in favor signify by saying aye. Passes unanimously.