

# **PROJECT LEVEL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS**

**for the**

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO**

**HOPKINS PARKING STRUCTURE**

**Part of the  
Final Environmental Impact Report  
for the  
University of California, San Diego  
2004 Long Range Development Plan**

**SCH No. 2003081023**

**Prepared for**



**University of California, San Diego  
9500 Gilman Drive  
La Jolla, California 92093**

**Prepared by**



**9275 Sky Park Court, Suite 200  
San Diego, California 92123**

**September 2004**

# CHAPTER 2.0

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

This chapter contains a brief summary of the proposed Hopkins Parking Structure project and its environmental consequences, as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. It also provides a brief description of the proposed Hopkins Parking Structure project, project objectives, alternatives to the proposed project, and areas of controversy known to the University of California. In addition, this chapter provides tables summarizing: (1) the potential environmental impacts that would occur as the result of implementation of the proposed project; (2) the level of impact significance before mitigation; (3) the recommended mitigation measures that would avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts; and (4) the level of impact significance after mitigation measures are implemented. A table is also provided which compares the anticipated impacts of the proposed Hopkins Parking Structure project with those of each alternative to the proposed project.

### 2.1 OVERVIEW

This EIR assesses the potential environmental effects of the proposed Hopkins Parking Structure project. As required by CEQA, this EIR (1) assesses the expected direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the physical development of the proposed Hopkins Parking Structure project; (2) identifies potentially feasible means of mitigating potential adverse impacts; and (3) evaluates potentially feasible alternatives to the proposed project, including the required No Project Alternative.

The Board of Regents of the University of California is the “lead agency” for the project evaluated in this EIR, and as such, has the principal responsibility for approving the proposed Hopkins Parking Structure project.

### 2.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Hopkins Parking Structure is proposed as seven levels of parking, including the roof level, in a structure containing approximately 1,421 parking spaces, partly below and partly above grade on an approximately 2.3-acre site. Because the grade slopes to the east on the project site, two levels of parking would be above grade on the western end, with five levels below grade; and on the eastern end, four levels would be above grade and three levels below. Vehicles would move between levels on a ramp oriented east/west along the northern side of the structure. Parking spaces would be located in a row on each side of the ramp, and in a row on each side of the driveway aisles running the length of the structure south of the ramp. The principal entrance for vehicles would be into the second level from Hopkins Drive on the east. A secondary entrance would be into the sixth level from Voigt Lane. An attendant booth would be located at each of the two vehicle entrances.

Accessible stalls, or handicapped parking, would be located at the western end of the structure on the top level and near elevators at the southeast and northwest corners of the structure. Parking space allocation is yet to be decided but is likely to be similar to the Gilman and Pangea parking structures, where about 13 percent of the stalls are allotted to faculty (“A” permits), 24 percent to staff (“B” permits), 50 percent to students (“S” permits), 8 percent to meters, 2 percent accessible, and 3 percent to others. Stairways would be located at the northwest and southeast corners of the structure. Air would be circulated in the structure by natural ventilation as much as possible, so that large areas of the building would be open to the outside or sheathed with screening for free air movement. However, much of the structure will be below grade, and two vertical ventilation shafts located in the interior of the building would be activated automatically by carbon monoxide (CO) sensors on the first and second levels. In addition, utility improvements and extensions would be required to provide sewer, water, electricity, telecommunications, and storm drainage services for the proposed Hopkins Parking Structure.

In addition to the space utilized for parking and circulation, the structure would have about 638 square feet of storage space under the ramp, and about 92 square feet in the southeast corner, on the lowest level, and about 1,000 square feet of space for which a use is not yet determined on the second level. The second-level space would be along the eastern wall and south of the Hopkins Drive entrance at ground level. Possible uses include office space for operation of the parking structure and/or retail space, such as a coffee shop with a “storefront” on the southeastern corner of the structure.

## 2.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the proposed Hopkins Parking Structure project are to:

- Increase the supply of parking on-campus by providing approximately 1,421 new spaces in accordance with the proposed 2004 Long-Range Development Plan.
- Maintain the UCSD campus target parking ratio of 0.41 space per capita for the regular academic session.
- Replace approximately 126 parking spaces at parking lot P354, planned to be eliminated by construction of the proposed SDSC Expansion project.
- Provide parking for faculty, staff, visitors, and students during daytime hours and for UCSD Extension and other campus events and programs on evenings and weekends.

## 2.4 IMPACT SUMMARY

Tables 2-1 and 2-2, presented at the end of this section, provides a complete listing of all the direct and indirect environmental impacts and mitigation measures that may occur as a result of implementation of the proposed Hopkins Parking Structure project. For each impact, Tables 2-1 and 2-2 identify the significance of the impact before mitigation, applicable mitigation measures, and the level of significance of the impact after the implementation of the mitigation measures.

## 2.5 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The following alternatives were analyzed in detail in the EIR and compared to the proposed Hopkins Parking Structure project. The objective of the alternatives analysis is to determine whether an alternative would feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives, while avoiding or substantially lessening some of the significant effects of the proposed project. The alternatives to the proposed Hopkins Parking Structure project include:

- **No Project Alternative.** Under the No Project alternative, no parking structure would be constructed, either on the proposed site or elsewhere. The project site would remain in its present condition, except that the basketball court would be relocated to Marshall College, since its relocation is a separate project.
- **Alternative Location at Revelle Lot 102.** This alternative would construct a parking structure in Revelle College, on a site now occupied by parking lot 102. The site is north of Revelle College Drive, east of North Torrey Pines Road, and south of Scholars Drive South. Preliminary studies indicate the site could support a structure providing from 1,100 to 2,000 parking spaces. The lower capacity could be achieved with five above-grade parking levels with an additional rooftop level. More capacity could be added by excavating the site to provide up to four below-grade levels. The project would include construction of a drop-off point for forum and theater patrons. In addition, the segment of Revelle College Drive north of the drop-off would be reduced to two lanes to match the campus loop road cross-section.
- **Alternative Location at Muir Lot 208.** This alternative would develop a parking structure on the northern part of Lot 208 on the northern border of Muir College. The site would accommodate a structure about 190 feet by 305 feet, yielding a footprint of about 58,000 square feet, about 12,000 square feet less than the proposed Hopkins Parking Structure. Assuming six levels, with four stories above grade, one below grade, and a rooftop level, about 1,100 parking spaces could be accommodated. Added below-grade capacity might be gained if the site were to prove suitable for excavation. The principal entry would be from Muir College Drive, which would be widened along the site's northern border. A secondary entry could be placed on the structure's eastern side, taking access from a new road between existing Lots 207 and 208, and west along the new structure's southern border to intersect with the Loop Road on the west.

Detailed descriptions and an analysis of potential impacts of each alternative are presented in Chapter 6, Alternatives (Volume I). Table 2-3 presents a comparison of the environmental impacts of these alternatives to the impacts that are expected to result from the proposed project. Based on an evaluation of conditions, as they are currently known, the two alternatives evaluated in this section and the proposed project do not differ significantly in their impacts on- and off-campus. Therefore, there is no environmentally superior alternative. The principal difference between the alternatives and the proposed project is the selected location, or the areas they are meant to serve, and timing, or when additional parking in a particular area will be required. Additional parking would be required sooner at the proposed project location than at either of the alternative locations because of the proposed SDSC Expansion project located adjacent to the proposed project site. With no other clear-cut environmental advantage for any of the alternative, the proposed project is more consistent than the others with the orderly planning for the development of the LRDP.

## 2.6 AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY

See Section 2.6 of Volume I for a complete list of associated with the proposed project that are known to the lead agency or were raised by agencies or interested parties during the NOP public and agency review period or a public scoping meeting. In addition, Appendix A in Volume II includes comments received on the NOP and at the scoping meetings.

This page intentionally left blank.

**Table 2-1. Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures\***

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
<b>4.1 Aesthetics</b>				
Scenic Vistas and Visual Character and Quality	Implementation of the Hopkins Parking Structure project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, but could degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings	PS	Review of design elements by UCSD Design Review Board (LRDP MM Aes-1A).	LS
Lighting and Glare	Implementation of the proposed Hopkins Parking Structure project would have the potential to create new sources of substantial light or glare on campus or the immediate vicinity which could adversely affect day or nighttime views in this area.	S	Direction and shielding of outdoor lighting (LRDP MM Aes-2B); orientation or shielding of vehicle headlights (LRDP MM Aes-2C).	LS
<b>4.2 Air Quality</b>				
Consistency with Applicable Air Quality Plan	The Hopkins Parking Structure project is not anticipated to conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the applicable air quality plan.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Consistency with Air Quality Standards	The Hopkins Parking Structure project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Sensitive Receptors	Implementation of the proposed project would have potential to expose sensitive receptors to minimal increases in both carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic pollutant concentrations.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Objectionable Odors	Implementation of the proposed project is not likely to produce objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
<b>4.3 Biological Resources</b>				
Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Plant Species	The Hopkins Parking Structure project is unlikely to impact sensitive plant species, since none have been observed on or adjacent to the project site, and there is little potential for them to occur in these areas.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Animal Species	The Hopkins Parking Structure project is unlikely to impact any sensitive animal species, as none have been observed on or adjacent to the project site and there is little potential for them to occur in these areas. However, raptor nests could occur with 500 feet of project-related construction activities and in such a case would be indirectly impacted.	S	Raptor nest surveys and avoidance (2004 LRDP MM Bio-2D).	LS
Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities	The Hopkins Parking Structure project is unlikely to impact riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities, since none have been observed on or adjacent to the project site and there is little potential for them to occur in these areas.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS

S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; PS = Potential Significant; SU = Significant/Unavoidable  
 \* Cumulative impacts and mitigation measure are summarized in Table 2-2.

**Table 2-1. (continued)**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Significance Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure(s)</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<b>4.3 Biological Resources (continued)</b>				
Wetlands	The Hopkins Parking Structure project is unlikely to impact wetlands as none have been observed on or adjacent to the project site.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Local Applicable Policies Protecting Biological Resources	The Hopkins Parking Structure project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
<b>4.4 Cultural Resources</b>				
Historical Resources	There are no historical resources on the project site.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Archaeological Resources	There are no archaeological resources recorded on the project site and there is limited potential for unrecorded subsurface archaeological resources to occur.	PS	Monitoring for unrecorded subsurface resources (Cul-2D) and, if applicable, identification of resources in Area of Potential Effect and evaluation of significance (Cul-2A); avoidance (Cul-2B); documentation and treatment (Cul-2C); and monitoring procedures (Cul-2E).	LS
Human Remains	Human remains are unlikely to occur under the project site.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Paleontological Resources	Implementation of the proposed project is not likely to impact significant paleontological resources during construction activities.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
<b>4.5 Geology and Soils</b>				
Exposure to Seismic-Related Hazards	The Hopkins Parking Structure project site may be exposed to some seismic hazards, but compliance with the California Building Code and UC Seismic Safety Policy would reduce seismic related hazards to people and structures.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Soil Erosion or Topsoil Loss	The Hopkins Parking Structure project could result in minimal amounts of increased erosion associated with construction activities.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Soil Stability	The project site is characterized by two soil conditions, undocumented fill and cohesionless sand, which would require stabilization in compliance with the provision of the California Building Code.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Expansive Soils	The project site is unlikely to contain expansive soils.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
<b>4.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>				
Transport, Use, and Disposal of Hazardous Materials	The Hopkins Parking Structure project would not result in the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS

S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; PS = Potential Significant; SU = Significant/Unavoidable

**Table 2-1. (continued)**

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
<b>4.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials (continued)</b>				
Accidental Releases	The Hopkins Parking Structure project would not substantially increase transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Hazards to Nearby Schools	Hazardous materials and waste could be handled within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; however, such materials associated with the Hopkins Parking Structure project are not anticipated to occur in quantities significant enough to pose a risk to occupants of the school or the campus community.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Listed Hazardous Materials Sites	No closed or active hazardous material sites are located on or near the project site and there is a low potential for unrecorded contamination to occur on the project site.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Hazards from Nearby Airports	Activities from MCAS Miramar and the Torrey Pines Gliderport would create minimal safety hazards to development of the Hopkins Parking Structure project.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Emergency Response And Evacuation Plans	Temporary road closures or detours associated with construction of the proposed Hopkins Parking Structure project could require alternate emergency response or evacuation routes.	S	Notification of emergency response providers (LRDP MM Haz-6A).	LS
Wildland Fires	The Hopkins Parking Structure project could be subject to the spread of wildfire from the Grove Reserve across Hopkins Drive.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
<b>4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality</b>				
Site Drainage and Hydrology	Implementation of the Hopkins Parking Structure project would have the potential to substantially alter drainages and hydrology which could increase runoff volumes resulting in flooding, exceedence of the existing storm water drainage system, and erosion.	PS	Project-specific drainage study, including implementation of site design BMPs and flow control BMPs if necessary (LRDP MM Hyd-1A).	LS
Water Quality	Implementation of the proposed project would generate pollutants during construction that would be managed in compliance with an NPDES permit and following construction activities, pollutants would likely be reduced.	PS	Preparation and implementation of a storm water mitigation plan for projects with the potential to generate substantial pollutants, including identification of site design and treatment control BMPs (LRDP MM Hyd-2B).	LS
Seiches, Tsunamis, and Mudflows	Implementation of the proposed project would not expose of people or structures to tsunami, because of its elevation above sea level, or mudflows, due to on-site topography.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS

S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; PS = Potential Significant; SU = Significant/Unavoidable



Table 2-1. (continued)

Issue	Impact	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance After Mitigation
<b>4.8 Land Use and Planning</b>				
Applicable Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations	Implementation of the Hopkins Parking Structure project would not result in inconsistencies with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Incompatibilities with Adjacent Land Uses	Implementation of the Hopkins Parking Structure project would not result in incompatibilities between campus development and adjacent community land uses.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
<b>4.9 Noise</b>				
Exposure to Permanent Ambient Noise	Classrooms and residences in the project vicinity would be affected by permanent noise levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL. Nuisance noise from the structure and ventilation system noise could adversely affect the sensitive receptors.	S	Appropriate design of parking structure ventilation system (Project MM Noi-1A).	LS
Temporary Increases in Ambient Noise	Construction of the proposed Hopkins Parking Structure project could result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels above levels existing without the project.	PS	Construction noise mitigation program (LRDP MM Noi-2A).	LS
Exposure to Aircraft Noise	Implementation of the Hopkins Parking Structure project would expose people residing or working in the project area to noise from aircraft.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Excessive Groundborne Vibration or Noise	Implementation of the Hopkins Parking Structure project is not likely to result in groundborne vibration from construction activities that affect sensitive equipment.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
<b>4.10 Population and Housing</b>				
Direct Inducement of Substantial Population Growth	The Hopkins Parking Structure project is part of UCSD's response to statewide population growth, and as part of the 2004 LRDP's planned growth of the campus, is beneficial in its effects.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Indirect Inducement of Substantial Population Growth	The Hopkins Parking Structure would result in little or no indirect inducement of population growth.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Displacement of Housing	The Hopkins Parking Structure would not displace existing housing.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Displacement of People	Implementation of the Hopkins Parking Structure project would not displace people living on or off campus.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
<b>4.11 Public Services</b>				
Fire Protection	Implementation of the Hopkins Parking Structure project is not likely to result in increased demand for fire service which could contribute to the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS

S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; PS = Potential Significant; SU = Significant/Unavoidable

**Table 2-1. (continued)**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Significance Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure(s)</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<b>4.11 Public Services (continued)</b>				
Police Protection	Implementation of the Hopkins Parking Structure project is not likely to result in increased demand for police service that would require new facilities that could result in a significant physical impact to the environment.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Public Schools	Implementation of the Hopkins Parking Structure project could contribute to demand for local public schools; however, it is unlikely that new or altered school facilities would be necessary.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
<b>4.12 Recreation</b>				
Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities	The Hopkins Parking Structure project would not cause the deterioration of on- and off-campus recreational facilities.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Construction of New Recreational Facilities	Implementation of the Hopkins Parking Structure project would not include construction or expansion of recreational facilities.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
<b>4.13 Transportation and Circulation</b>				
Increases in Traffic	The Hopkins Parking Structure project would generate traffic consistent with overall campus-wide growth as discussed in the 2004 LRDP EIR. Queues at the entrances could affect local street traffic under some circumstances. Construction could affect local street traffic near the site.	PS	Provide traffic control for construction and special events (LRDP MM Tra-1B). Reconfigure Hopkins Drive to provide turn lanes at the project entry (Project MM Tra-1A and Tra-1B).	LS
Parking Capacity	Implementation of the proposed project would not result in inadequate parking capacity on or off campus	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Alternative Transportation Plans, Policies, and Programs	Implementation of the proposed Hopkins Parking Structure project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
<b>4.14 Utilities and Service Systems</b>				
Wastewater Treatment	Implementation of the Hopkins Parking Structure project could affect wastewater treatment by the City by increasing wastewater flows or by altering wastewater quality. However, UCSD will comply with City of San Diego Industrial User Discharge permit requirements which will avoid this impact.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS

S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; PS = Potential Significant; SU = Significant/Unavoidable

**Table 2-1. (continued)**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Impact</b>	<b>Significance Before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure(s)</b>	<b>Significance After Mitigation</b>
<b><i>4.14 Utilities and Service Systems (continued)</i></b>				
New Water or Wastewater Facilities	Implementation of the proposed project will not result in the development of new water and wastewater facilities that may have a direct adverse physical effect on the environment. As part of the 2004 LRDP, the Hopkins Parking Structure will contribute to an overall demand for new facilities that could result in adverse effects on the environment, but such adverse effects would be mitigated as recommended in Volume I.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Impacts from New Storm Water Facilities	Implementation of the proposed project would require the construction of new off-site storm water drainage facilities but would not require the expansion of existing facilities.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Water Supply Availability	Implementation of the proposed project would result in additional water demand, which could be accommodated by existing and projected entitlements.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Landfill Capacity	Solid waste disposal needs would be served by adequate existing and planned future landfill capacity in the County of San Diego.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Applicable Solid Waste Regulations	Implementation of the proposed project would not result in UCSD's failure to comply with relevant regulations regarding solid waste.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Energy Consumption	Implementation of the proposed project will create additional demand for energy which may require development of new facilities, but would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS
Telecommunication Facilities	No new off-site telecommunications facilities would be required to serve the Hopkins Parking Structure.	LS	No mitigation is required.	LS

S = Significant; LS = Less than Significant; PS = Potential Significant; SU = Significant/Unavoidable

**Table 2-2. Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Issue	Significance of Cumulative Impact	Proposed Project Contribution	Mitigation Measures	Proposed Project Significance Considering Mitigation
<b>4.1 Aesthetics</b>				
Degradation of views to scenic coastal areas.	Potentially significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Regional light pollution on astronomical viewing activities.	Potentially significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
<b>4.2 Air Quality</b>				
Consistency with applicable air quality plan	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Consistency with air quality standards	Significant.	Cumulatively considerable.	Unavoidable even with implementation of LRDP MM Air-CA and Air-CB.	Not cumulatively considerable.
Sensitive receptors	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Objectionable odors	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
<b>4.3 Biological Resources</b>				
Regional loss of sensitive plants, animals, and vegetation communities.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
<b>4.4 Cultural Resources</b>				
Regional loss of archeological resources.	Potentially significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Regional loss of historical resources.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Regional loss of paleontological resources.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
<b>4.5 Geology and Soils</b>				
Regional exposure of persons to the hazards of seismic ground shaking.	Potentially significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Regional exposure of persons to other seismic related or geotechnical hazards.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Erosion or loss of topsoil in affected watersheds due to development.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
<b>4.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>				
Regional use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Regional exposure of people to contaminated sites.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Exposure of people and structures to wildland fires	Significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
<b>4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality</b>				
Increases in storm water runoff within the watershed could contribute to downstream erosion problems.	Significant.	Not cumulatively considerable with implementation of LRDP MM Hyd-1A.	Project-specific drainage study including implementation of site design BMPs and flow control BMPs if necessary (Hyd-1A).	Not applicable.

Table 2-2. (continued)

Issue	Significance of Cumulative Impact	Proposed Project Contribution	Mitigation Measures	Proposed Project Significance Considering Mitigation
<b>4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality (continued)</b>				
Development within watershed could increase pollutant sources and adversely affect receiving waters.	Significant.	Not cumulatively considerable with implementation of LRDP MM Hyd-2B.	Preparation and implementation of a storm water mitigation plan for projects with the potential to generate substantial pollutants, including identification of site design and treatment control BMPs (Hyd-2B).	Not applicable.
<b>4.8 Land Use and Planning</b>				
Inconsistencies with applicable land use plans, policies and regulations.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Incompatibilities with adjacent land uses.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
<b>4.9 Noise</b>				
Consistency with applicable standards.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Transportation noise.	Potentially significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Stationary noise.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Construction noise.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Aircraft noise.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Generation of groundborne vibration.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Inconsistencies with applicable land use plans, policies and regulations.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Incompatibilities with adjacent land uses.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
<b>4.10 Population and Housing</b>				
Incremental increase to the regional housing demand.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
<b>4.11 Public Services</b>				
Increased need for fire protection services would require new facilities potentially resulting in adverse physical impacts.	Potentially significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Increased need for police protection services would require new facilities potentially resulting in adverse physical impacts.	Potentially significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
There may not be a need for new public schools, although facilities improvements have been and will continue to be undertaken.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.

**Table 2-2. (continued)**

Issue	Significance of Cumulative Impact	Proposed Project Contribution	Mitigation Measures	Proposed Project Significance Considering Mitigation
<b>4.12 Recreation</b>				
Deterioration of Parks and Recreational Facilities	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Construction of New Recreational Facilities	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
<b>4.13 Transportation, Traffic, and Parking</b>				
Off-campus impacts due to overall growth of UCSD.	Significant and unavoidable.	Cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Inadequate parking capacity in surrounding vicinity.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Regional conflicts with alternative transportation plans and policies.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
<b>4.14 Utilities and Service Systems</b>				
Regional development could affect wastewater treatment capabilities.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Regional development could generate a cumulative demand for new water, wastewater or storm water facilities.	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Regional development could generate cumulative demand beyond water supply availability	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Regional development could generate cumulative demand beyond available landfill capacity	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Regional development could generate cumulative demand causing increased energy consumption	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.
Regional development could generate a cumulative demand for new telecommunication facilities	Less than significant.	Not cumulatively considerable.	Not applicable.	Not applicable.

**Table 2-3. Summary of Analysis for Alternatives to the Proposed Hopkins Parking Structure Project**

Issue Areas with Potential for Significant Impacts under the Proposed Hopkins Parking Structure Project or Its Alternatives	Proposed Project		Alternatives to the Proposed Project		
	Without Mitigation	With Mitigation	No Project	Alternative Location at Revelle Lot 102	Alternative Location at Muir Lot 208
<b>4.1 Aesthetics</b>					
Scenic Vistas and Visual Character and Quality	S	LS	○	○	—
Lighting and Glare	S	LS	○	—	—
<b>4.2 Air Quality</b>					
Cumulative Impacts from PM <sub>10</sub> Emissions	S	SU	▼	—	—
<b>4.3 Biological Resources</b>					
Candidate, Sensitive, or Special Status Animal Species	S	LS	○	—	○
<b>4.3 Cultural Resources</b>					
Archaeological Resources	PS	LS	○	—	—
<b>4.6 Hazardous Materials</b>					
Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans	S	LS	○	—	—
<b>4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality</b>					
Site Drainage and Hydrology	S	LS	○	—	—
Water Quality	S	LS	○	—	—
<b>4.8 Land Use and Planning</b>					
Applicable Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations	LS	LS	▲	—	—
<b>4.9 Noise</b>					
Exposure to Permanent Ambient Noise	S	LS	○	—	—
Temporary Increases in Ambient Noise	PS	LS	○	—	—
<b>4.13 Transportation, Traffic, and Parking</b>					
Increases in Traffic	S	LS	○	—	—
Parking Capacity	LS	LS	▲	—	—
<b>4.14 Utilities and Service Systems</b>					
Wastewater Treatment	PS	LS	○	—	—

▲ Alternative is likely to result in greater impacts to issue when compared to proposed project.

— Alternative is likely to result in a similar impact to issue when compared to proposed project.

▼ Alternative is likely to result in less impacts to issue when compared to proposed project; however, impacts would still be significant before mitigation.

○ Alternative is likely to result in less impact to issue when compared to proposed project, and impacts would likely be less than significant and not require mitigation.

PS Potentially significant impact.

LS Less than significant impact.

S Significant Impact.

SU Significant and unavoidable impact.