

AMENDED IN SENATE MAY 27, 1998

Senate Concurrent Resolution

No. 92

Introduced by Senator Peace

(Principal coauthors: Senators Brulte and Polanco)

(Principal coauthors: Assembly Members Baldwin and Ducheny)

(Coauthors: Senators Alpert, Ayala, Burton, Calderon, ~~Costa~~, Craven, Dills, Haynes, Hughes, Karnette, Kelley, Kopp, McPherson, Monteith, O'Connell, Rainey, Rosenthal, Schiff, Sher, Solis, Thompson, and Vasconcellos)

(Coauthors: Assembly Members Aguiar, Alby, Alquist, Ashburn, Baca, Battin, Baugh, Bowler, Brewer, Bustamante, Campbell, Cardenas, Cardoza, Cedillo, Cunneen, Davis, Escutia, Figueroa, Firestone, Frusetta, Gallegos, Goldsmith, Granlund, Havice, Honda, Kaloogian, Knox, Kuykendall, Leach, Lempert, Leonard, Machado, Margett, Mazzoni, Morrissey, Morrow, Olberg, Oller, Pacheco, Poochigian, Prenter, Richter, Runner, Shelley, Strom-Martin, Takasugi, Thompson, Thomson, Torlakson, Villaraigosa, Vincent, Wayne, Woods, and Wright)

May 7, 1998

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 92—Relative to the proposed City of Chula Vista site as a future University of California campus.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SCR 92, as amended, Peace. Proposed City of Chula Vista site for a future University of California campus.

This measure would resolve that the ~~designation of the Legislature endorses the~~ proposed City of Chula Vista site as a future University of California campus ~~would create an opportunity to build synergistic relationships with nearby industries to expand economic development.~~

Fiscal committee: no.

1 WHEREAS, The Department of Finance forecasts that
2 postsecondary education enrollment within California
3 will reach 2,276,886 by the year 2005; and

4 WHEREAS, The Department of Finance projects that
5 the demand for higher education in the state will increase
6 by over 437,000 students over the next 10 years; and

7 WHEREAS, The current system of public higher
8 education has the capacity to enroll an additional 100,000
9 students, mostly through the community college system;
10 and

11 WHEREAS, State law requires the University of
12 California to admit the top 12.5 percent of graduating
13 seniors; and

14 WHEREAS, The University of California will soon have
15 the ability to accommodate only 7 percent to 9 percent of
16 graduating seniors; and

17 WHEREAS, Currently the University of California at
18 San Diego only accepts the top 4 percent to 5 percent of
19 graduating seniors; and

20 WHEREAS, A shortage of enrollment capacity
21 threatens to deny admission to students who are qualified
22 for admission to the University of California; and

23 WHEREAS, The creation of a future University of
24 California campus will greatly alleviate campus
25 overcrowding and more readily satisfy the statutory
26 mandate to provide top graduating seniors the
27 opportunity to attend the University of California; and

28 WHEREAS, The University of California at Irvine, the
29 University of California at San Diego, and the University
30 of California at Davis have experienced sharp declines in
31 the number of Black and Latino undergraduate
32 admissions as freshmen for next fall; and



1 WHEREAS, Latino admissions declined by 20 percent
2 at the University of California Davis, 31 percent at
3 University of California San Diego, and 8.6 percent at
4 University of California Irvine; and

5 WHEREAS, The number of Black students admitted
6 declined 36 percent at the University of California at
7 Davis, 19 percent at the University of California at Irvine,
8 and 45 percent at the University of California at San
9 Diego; and

10 WHEREAS, The University of California's most
11 selective campuses—the University of California at Los
12 Angeles and the University of California at
13 Berkeley—have predicted drops of 50 percent to 70
14 percent in Black and Latino undergraduate admissions;
15 and

16 WHEREAS, University of California officials state that
17 the declines are particularly disturbing because minority
18 student applications increased substantially this year; and

19 WHEREAS, The creation of a future University of
20 California campus will provide greater opportunities for
21 underrepresented ethnic groups to attend the University
22 of California; and

23 WHEREAS, San Diego County is the second most
24 populated county in the State of California with a current
25 population of 2,724,400 residents; and

26 WHEREAS, San Diego County is one of the State of
27 California's most ethnically diverse counties with a large
28 Latino population; and

29 WHEREAS, San Diego County has been and is
30 projected to continue to be one of the fastest growing
31 counties in the State of California, with population
32 growth reaching 3,267,254 residents by the year 2005; and

33 WHEREAS, The creation of a future University of
34 California campus within San Diego County will serve a
35 populous, growing, economically strategic and ethically
36 diverse community which currently does not have
37 adequate access to a University of California education;
38 and

39 WHEREAS, The City of Chula Vista has proposed that
40 the University of California Board of Regents designate



1 a site of approximately 1,100 acres within the city as a
2 future University of California campus; and

3 WHEREAS, The City of Chula Vista is San Diego
4 County's second largest city with a population
5 approaching 160,000 residents; and

6 WHEREAS, The City of Chula Vista is located in south
7 San Diego County, approximately three miles north of
8 the international border and contains a large
9 underserved population; and

10 WHEREAS, The City of Chula Vista and the County of
11 San Diego have jointly adopted identical general plans for
12 the 23,000 acre Otay Ranch master planned community
13 expressly including a location for a university campus;
14 and

15 WHEREAS, The Chula Vista and county general plans
16 were supported by a certified Environmental Impact
17 Report that evaluated the impacts of a university campus
18 within the master planned community; and

19 WHEREAS, The adequacy of the Environmental
20 Impact Report was validated by the San Diego County
21 Superior Court, the Fourth District Court of Appeals, and
22 the California Supreme Court (Chapparal Greens v. City
23 of Chula Vista, (50 Cal. App. 4th 1134, Rev./Rehearing
24 denied, 1997 Cal. LEXIS 725); and

25 WHEREAS, Approximately 697 acres of the proposed
26 university site are free of biological and topographic
27 constraints and deemed developable pursuant to the
28 certified EIR and the San Diego Multi-Species
29 Conservation Plan (MSCP) as adopted by the County of
30 San Diego, and ratified by the Department of Fish and
31 Game and the United States Fish and Wildlife Agency;
32 and

33 WHEREAS, The proposed university campus
34 overlooks the planned Otay Valley Regional Park which
35 connects the San Diego Bay with the Otay Lakes and San
36 Ysidro Mountains; and

37 WHEREAS, The Chula Vista and County General
38 Plans and the MSCP program permit up to 400 acres of
39 the Otay Valley Regional Park to be used for active



1 recreational, potentially including activities in support of
2 a university; and

3 WHEREAS, The proposed university campus is
4 surrounded on two sides by an 11,375 acre biological
5 preserve which can serve as a living museum from which
6 to study southern California's uniquely diverse and
7 complex environmental systems; and

8 WHEREAS, While the proposed campus is next to a
9 permanently preserved, publicly owned and managed,
10 massive open space system, the site is also only 17 miles
11 from downtown San Diego and Lindbergh International
12 Airport and only three miles north of the international
13 border and Rodriquez International Airport; and

14 WHEREAS, The proposed university campus is located
15 immediately adjacent to the 160 acre United State
16 Olympic Training Center, the only all weather Olympic
17 training facility in the nation; and

18 WHEREAS, The proposed university campus
19 overlooks the City of San Diego's Otay Lakes, a reservoir
20 system that provides sports and recreational
21 opportunities for southern Californians; and

22 WHEREAS, The proposed university campus is
23 immediately adjacent to the SR 125, a planned toll-road,
24 now undergoing final environmental review and
25 scheduled to be operational in the year 2001, connecting
26 the international border with the San Diego County
27 freeway system; and

28 WHEREAS, The proposed university campus is part of
29 the large-scale master planned Otay Ranch community
30 with comprehensive facility financing plans in place to
31 ensure the timely provision of needed public
32 infrastructure to the university campus, including roads,
33 sewer, water, and drainage facilities; and

34 WHEREAS, The San Diego Metropolitan Transit
35 Development Board has incorporated the extension of
36 San Diego's existing light-rail transit system into its long
37 range plans to serve the university campus and
38 surrounding neighborhoods; and

39 WHEREAS, The proposed university campus is owned
40 by only three property owners, all of whom have



1 expressed a willingness to make the land available for a
 2 University of California campus; and

3 WHEREAS, The timely designation of the proposed
 4 City of Chula Vista site as a future University of California
 5 campus by the Board of Regents would capture a
 6 transitory opportunity to secure a uniquely qualified
 7 location upon which to grow the University of California
 8 system and serve the citizens of the State of California for
 9 generations to come; and

10 WHEREAS, The proposed university campus is located
 11 three miles north of the international border and one
 12 mile north of the 6,000 acre Otay Mesa industrial area; and

13 WHEREAS, Otay Mesa industrial area, in conjunction
 14 with the Maquiladora industries along the international
 15 border, are poised to provide the economic engine to
 16 propel the San Diego region and all of California well into
 17 the next millennium; and

18 WHEREAS, The emergence of a world economy
 19 reliant upon Latin American markets, has crystallized the
 20 need to build cross-border knowledge, understanding
 21 and appreciation; ~~now, therefore, be it~~

22 ~~Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, the~~
 23 ~~Assembly thereof concurring, That the and~~

24 WHEREAS, *The* designation of the proposed City of
 25 Chula Vista site as a future University of California
 26 campus will create a unique opportunity to build
 27 synergetic relationships with nearby industries to expand
 28 economic development; and ~~be it further~~

29 *WHEREAS, The endorsement of the proposed City of*
 30 *Chula Vista site as a future University of California*
 31 *campus would enhance opportunities for California's*
 32 *students to attend the University of California, and would*
 33 *create an opportunity to further international education*
 34 *while preserving the designation and use of the land;*
 35 *now, therefore, be it*

36 RESOLVED BY THE SENATE OF THE STATE OF
 37 CALIFORNIA, THE ASSEMBLY THEREOF
 38 CONCURRING, *That the designation of the proposed*
 39 *City of Chula Vista site as a future University of California*
 40 *campus will greatly relieve overcrowding in the*



1 *University of California system, will enhance*
2 *opportunities for top graduating students to attend the*
3 *University of California, will provide greater*
4 *opportunities for underrepresented students to receive a*
5 *University of California education, will foster*
6 *international education and economic development, and*
7 *will promote opportunities for research into one of*
8 *California's most fragile ecosystems; and be it further*

9 *RESOLVED, That timely acceptance of the proposed*
10 *site as a future University of California campus is*
11 *necessary to preclude urbanization of the site by*
12 *conflicting uses; and be it further*

13 *RESOLVED, That the Legislature endorses the*
14 *proposed site as a future University of California campus;*
15 *and be it further*

16 *Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit*
17 *copies of this resolution to the Board of Regents of the*
18 *University of California.*

