

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3.0	Research Park Master Plan.....	3-1
3.1	Introduction.....	3-1
3.2	Project Summary.....	3-1
3.2.1	Project Description.....	3-1
3.2.2	Alternatives to the Proposed Project.....	3-2
3.2.3	Mitigation Monitoring Program.....	3-3
3.3	Detailed Project Description.....	3-11
3.3.1	Project Location.....	3-11
3.3.2	Project Needs and Objectives.....	3-11
3.3.3	Planning Process.....	3-11
3.3.4	Description of the Research Park Master Plan.....	3-12
3.3.5	Population.....	3-15
3.3.6	Roadways, Access, and Parking.....	3-15
3.3.7	Landscaping.....	3-15
3.3.8	Public Services.....	3-16
3.3.9	Utilities and Support Services.....	3-16
3.3.10	Construction Schedule.....	3-18
3.3.11	Permits and Approvals.....	3-18
3.4	Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.....	3-21
3.4.1	Aesthetics.....	3-21
3.4.2	Agricultural Resources.....	3-25
3.4.3	Air Quality.....	3-26
3.4.4	Biological Resources.....	3-29
3.4.5	Cultural Resources.....	3-35
3.4.6	Geology, Soils, and Seismicity.....	3-37
3.4.7	Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	3-38
3.4.8	Hydrology and Water Quality.....	3-40
3.4.9	Land Use and Planning.....	3-42
3.4.10	Noise.....	3-43
3.4.11	Population and Housing.....	3-45
3.4.12	Public Services.....	3-46
3.4.13	Recreation.....	3-46
3.4.14	Traffic, Circulation, and Parking.....	3-47
3.4.15	Utilities.....	3-57
3.5	Alternatives.....	3-58
3.5.1	Alternatives Considered But Rejected.....	3-59
3.5.2	Alternatives Evaluated in Detail.....	3-60
3.5.3	The Environmentally Superior Alternative.....	3-75
3.6	References.....	3-75

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tables

Table 3-1	Research Park Master Plan Summary of Impacts and Mitigation
Table 3-2	Comparison of RPMP Alternatives
Table 3-3	University of California, Davis Research Park Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring Program
Table 3-4	Estimated Construction Emissions for the RPMP
Table 3-5	Estimated Operational Emissions from the RPMP
Table 3-6	Research Park Traffic Noise Impact Analysis Results
Table 3-7	Intersection Operations – Existing Conditions
Table 3-8	Ramp Junction Levels of Service – Existing Conditions I-80/Old Davis Road Interchange
Table 3-9	Proposed Project Trip Generation
Table 3-10	Intersection Operations – Existing Plus Project Conditions
Table 3-11	Ramp Junction Levels of Service – Existing Plus Project Conditions I-80/Old Davis Road Interchange

Figures

Figure 3-1	Research Park Master Plan
Figure 3-2	RPMP Utilities
Figure 3-3	Research Park Master Plan Existing Conditions
Figure 3-4	Research Park Master Plan Existing Plus Project Conditions

3.0 RESEARCH PARK MASTER PLAN

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This section of the EIR presents the environmental impacts that could potentially result from the adoption and implementation of a Research Park Master Plan (RPMP) proposed by the campus for the development of 38 acres of UC Davis land, west of Old Davis Road and north and south of I-80 (Figure 1-1). The land on the west campus designated in the proposed LRDP as Research Park–Low Density is not part of the RPMP.

The proposed RPMP is available for review during normal operating hours at Reserves in Shields Library on campus; at Reserves in the Carlson Health Sciences Library on campus; at the Yolo County Public Library, 315 E. 14th Street, Davis; the Vacaville Public Library, 1020 Ulatis Drive, Vacaville; the Dixon Public Library, 230 North First Street, Dixon; and at the Winters Public Library, 210 First Street, Winters; and online at <http://www.ormp.ucdavis.edu/enviroreview/>. Copies of the document may also be obtained on campus at the Office of Resource Management and Planning (ORMP), 376 Mrak Hall.

3.2 PROJECT SUMMARY

3.2.1 Project Description

The proposed RPMP addresses the development of research park buildings and associated infrastructure, parking, and landscaping on two parcels with a total area of approximately 38 acres on Old Davis Road north and south of I-80. The RPMP includes a site development plan as well as planning concepts and design guidelines for future building designs and development on the RPMP site. The RPMP is designed to create a framework to accommodate and encourage the growing private, public, and University research relationships at UC Davis. The proposed development under the RPMP would include one or two two-story buildings on the northern parcel and five or six two-story buildings on the southern parcel, with a total of approximately 480,000 gross square feet (gsf) of built space. The buildings would accommodate laboratories and offices. The University of California would retain ownership of the land but would lease this land to a third-party developer. The RPMP would be developed by the third-party developer and the buildings or portions of the buildings would be leased to private, public, and nonprofit organizations with research affiliations with UC Davis or to UC Davis research programs.

Table 3-1 presents a summary of the environmental impacts that could potentially result from the adoption and implementation of the RPMP. The table is organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Section 3.4, below, and is arranged in four columns: (1) the identified impact under each issue area, (2) significance of impact prior to mitigation, (3) LRDP mitigation measure and/or the project-specific mitigation measure; and (4) the significance of impact after mitigation.

The RPMP is part of the growth program analyzed in the 2003 LRDP. Accordingly, the RPMP would contribute to the cumulative impacts associated with the 2003 LRDP and other projected regional growth. All of the cumulative impacts of the 2003 LRDP are analyzed in the technical sections of Volumes I and II of this EIR, and are not specifically addressed in the impact sections that follow. The significant cumulative impacts to which the RPMP would contribute include

the following: impact on scenic vistas (LRDP Impact 4.1.4); impact on visual character and quality of the region (LRDP Impact 4.1.5); impact from new sources of light and glare (LRDP Impact 4.1-6); loss of prime farmland (LRDP Impact 4.2-3); contribution to regional emissions of non-attainment pollutants (LRDP Impact 4.3-6); loss of agricultural land and ruderal/annual grassland habitat (LRDP Impact 4.4-12); impact on valley elderberry longhorn beetle (LRDP Impact 4.4-14); impact on cultural resources (LRDP Impact 4.5-5); impact on the regional deep aquifer (LRDP Impact 4.8-13); impact on the regional shallow/intermediate aquifer (LRDP Impact 4.8-14); water quality impact associated with increased urban runoff (LRDP Impact 4.8-10); impact on ambient noise levels (LRDP Impact 4.10-5); impact associated with new police and fire facilities (LRDP Impact 4.12-6); impact associated with new school facilities (LRDP Impact 4.12-7); impact associated with new recreational facilities (LRDP Impact 4.13-2); impact on the level of service of off-campus intersections (LRDP Impact 4.14-2); and impact associated with new wastewater treatment facilities (LRDP Impact 4.15-10).

3.2.2 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

The following six alternatives to the proposed RPMP, including the No Project Alternative, were analyzed for their ability to avoid or reduce any significant project impacts while meeting most of the objectives of the proposed project.

- **Alternative 1: North I-80 Site Only.** This alternative assumes that development would occur only on the 11-acre Research Park parcel north of I-80. The existing agricultural uses on the southern parcel would continue.
- **Alternative 2: South I-80 Site Only.** Under this alternative, all Research Park uses would be located on the 27-acre parcel south of I-80. This alternative would allow the parcel north of I-80 to remain dedicated to teaching and research uses, including its existing use as horse pasture.
- **Alternative 3: South Entry Site.** This alternative proposes to locate the Research Park on a different parcel at the south entry to the campus. This 25-acre parcel is north of I-80, east of Old Davis Road, and south of the Arboretum. Under this alternative, the existing uses of both of the Research Park parcels would continue, and the current agricultural uses of this south entry site would be relocated elsewhere on campus.
- **Alternative 4: Smaller Research Park.** This alternative proposes a smaller Research Park that would have half of the square footage of the proposed RPMP and about 1,200 employees. This smaller Research Park would be located on the 27-acre parcel south of I-80.
- **Alternative 5: Higher Density.** This alternative proposes to develop the same amount of building space on the same two parcels as proposed under the RPMP but within a smaller footprint. The alternative would include four-story buildings with parking structures instead of two-story buildings with surface parking. This alternative assumes the same number of employees.
- **Alternative 6: No Project.** Under the No Project Alternative, no Research Park would be built on the central and south campus, and research staff associated with

this Research Park would not be added to the campus population. The existing uses on the sites proposed for the Research Park would continue.

Table 3-2 presents a summary comparison of the project impacts with those of each alternative, including any additional impacts that could result from the alternatives.

3.2.3 Mitigation Monitoring Program

CEQA requires that a Lead Agency establish a program to report on and monitor measures adopted as part of the environmental review process to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. This Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) is designed to ensure that mitigation measures identified specifically for the RPMP portion of the 2003 LRDP are implemented. The RPMP MMP, as outlined in Table 3-3, describes monitoring and reporting procedures, monitoring responsibilities, and monitoring schedules for project-specific mitigation measures identified in the RPMP analysis of the 2003 UC Davis LRDP EIR (Section 3.4, Volume III). The MMP for the 2003 LRDP Program, which is presented in Volume I of this EIR, addresses program-level mitigation measures, many of which are also applicable to the RMI. These program-level mitigation measures are not addressed in this project-specific MMP. Both levels of applicable mitigation measures will be implemented and monitored during project development.

A variety of campus entities have been assigned monitoring responsibilities under this MMP. All monitoring actions, once completed, would be reported (in writing) to the UC Davis Office of Resource Management and Planning, which would maintain mitigation monitoring records for the proposed project. The MMP will be considered by The Regents in conjunction with project review and will be included as a condition of project approval.

The components of this table are addressed briefly below.

Mitigation Measures: The mitigation measures are taken verbatim from Section 3.2, Volume III of this Final EIR, and the numbers assigned the mitigation measures are the same as those presented in the Final EIR.

Monitoring and Reporting Procedure: Identifies the actions that must be completed to verify implementation of the mitigation measure.

Mitigation Timing: Identifies the timing for implementation of each action. Each entry in the table begins with a two-letter code. These codes indicate when the mitigation measure must be implemented in the typical project cycle in order to effectively accomplish the intended outcome. The meaning of these codes is as follows:

SS – During site selection

DE – During detailed project planning or project design, prior to project approval

CO – During construction

OC – Prior to occupancy

OP – During operation

Monitoring and Reporting Responsibility: Identifies the UC Davis office responsible for undertaking the required action and monitoring the mitigation measure.

**Table 3-1
Research Park Master Plan Summary of Impacts and Mitigation**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance Following Mitigation	
2.4.1 Aesthetics				
RPMP 3.4-1	Implementation of the RPMP would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	LS	Mitigation is not required.	LS
RPMP 3.4-2	Implementation of the RPMP would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	LS	Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.1-2(a) and (b).	LS
RPMP 3.4-3	Implementation of the RPMP would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	LS	Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.1-3(a-c).	LS
3.4.2 Agricultural Resources				
RPMP 3.4-4	Implementation of the RPMP would convert approximately 27 acres of prime farmland (as described by the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program) to nonagricultural uses.	S	Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.2-1.	SU
3.4.3 Air Quality				
RPMP 3.4-5	Construction activities at the RPMP site would result in short-term emissions of criteria pollutants.	S	Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.3-3(a-c).	SU
RPMP 3.4-6	Routine activities at the RPMP site would result in increased levels of operational emissions of criteria pollutants.	PS	RPMP Mitigation 3.4-6: To reduce NO _x emissions, the campus shall conduct testing of only one of the project's three emergency generators on a given day.	LS
3.4.4 Biological Resources				
RPMP 3.4-7	Implementation of the RPMP would result in the conversion of approximately 38 acres of Agricultural Land and Ruderal/Annual a Grassland habitat, potentially suitable for western burrowing owl.	PS	Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.4-3(b), (c), and (d).	LS

Note: Resource areas with no project-specific impacts are not listed in this table.

LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU Significant and unavoidable

3.0 RESEARCH PARK MASTER PLAN

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance Following Mitigation
RPMP 3.4-8	Implementation of the RPMP would result in the loss of potential habitat for the Valley elderberry longhorn beetle.	PS	Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.4-6(a) (avoidance). If avoidance of the identified elderberry shrubs is infeasible, implement LRDP Mitigation 4.4-6(b). LRDP Mitigations 4.4-6(a) and (b) shall be applied to each subsequent phase of development.	LS
RPMP 3.4-9	Implementation of the RPMP could result in the failure of Swainson’s hawk nesting, and in the loss of active nest sites.	PS	Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.4-4(a) and 4.4-5.	LS
RPMP 3.4-10	Development of a new storm drain outfall for the RPMP at the Arboretum waterway could result in the adverse modification of wetlands or other waters of the U.S. that fall under the jurisdiction of the ACOE and/or CDFG.	PS	Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.4-8(a-c).	LS
RPMP 3.4-11	Development of a new storm drain outfall at the Arboretum waterway for the RPMP could result in the loss of potential habitat for the northwestern pond turtle or otherwise affect the species during construction.	PS	Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.4-7.	LS
RPMP 3.4-12	Implementation of the RPMP would result in the removal of trees recognized to meet the campus’ standards for Important trees, including: (i) <i>Heritage Trees</i> : healthy valley oak trees with trunk diameters of 33 inches or greater at a height of 54 inches from the ground. (ii) <i>Specimen Trees</i> : healthy trees or stands of trees that are of high value to the campus due to their size, species, extraordinary educational and research value, and/or other exceptional local importance.	PS	Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.4-11 for both parcels.	SU

Note: Resource areas with no project-specific impacts are not listed in this table.

LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU Significant and unavoidable

Volume III

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance Following Mitigation
3.4.5 Cultural Resources				
RPMP 3.4-13	Implementation of the RPMP could damage or destroy an archaeological resource or historic building or structure as a result of grading, excavation, ground disturbance or other project development.	PS	Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(b)(i) and (ii). In the event of a discovery, implement LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(b)(vi) and/or 4.5-4, as applicable.	LS
3.4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
RPMP 3.4-14	Implementation of the RPMP could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials.	PS	Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.7-1 and 4.7-10.	LS
RPMP 3.4-15	Implementation of the RPMP could expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated soil or groundwater.	PS	RPMP Mitigation 3.4-15(a): The campus shall require the developer of the RPMP to perform a due diligence investigation that includes a review of past and current uses of the site for activities that may have involved hazardous materials use or hazardous waste disposal. RPMP Mitigation 3.4-15(b): If the review identifies activities or practices that may have resulted in releases of hazardous materials to the soil or groundwater, the campus or developer shall conduct additional investigation and remediation as appropriate.	LS
3.4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality				
RPMP 3.4-16	RPMP construction activities would not contribute substantial loads of sediment or other pollutants in storm water runoff that could degrade receiving water quality.	LS	Implement LRP Mitigation 4.8-1.	LS
RPMP 3.4-17	Implementation of the RPMP would increase the amount of water extracted from the shallow/intermediate and deep aquifers and would increase impervious surface. Extraction from the aquifers could deplete groundwater levels and could contribute to local subsidence,	S	Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.8-5(a) and 4.8-6(a) and (e).	SU

Note: Resource areas with no project-specific impacts are not listed in this table.

LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU Significant and unavoidable

3.0 RESEARCH PARK MASTER PLAN

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance Following Mitigation
	and increased impervious surface coverage could interfere substantially with recharge. This could result in a net deficit in the aquifers or a lowering of the local groundwater table.			
3.4.9 Land Use and Planning				
RPMP 3.4-18	Implementation of the RPMP would not result in development that is substantially incompatible with existing or planned adjacent land uses.	LS	Mitigation is not required.	LS
3.4.10 Noise				
RPMP 3.4-19	Traffic to and from the RPMP site would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	LS	Mitigation is not required.	LS
3.4.14 Traffic, Circulation and Parking				
RPMP 3.4-20	Implementation of the RPMP would cause unacceptable intersection operations.	S	Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.14-1(a-c) and 4.14-2(a-c). RPMP Mitigation 3.4-20: As needed based on the occupancy levels and occupancy dates of each building in the RPMP, to maintain adequate levels of service, the campus shall obtain funding for traffic signals at Old Davis Road and I-80.	LS
RPMP 3.4-21	Implementation of the RPMP would not cause unacceptable levels of service on RPMP roadways listed in the Yolo County and Solano County Congestion Management Plans.	LS	Mitigation is not required.	LS
RPMP 3.4-22	Implementation of the RPMP would not create an additional parking demand on campus facilities.	LS	Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.14-3(a and b).	LS
Utilities				
RPMP 3.4-23	Implementation of the RPMP would place a demand on campus utilities that would not result in significant environmental impacts.	LS	Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.8-5(a), 4.8-6(a), and 4.15-6(b) or an equivalent measure.	LS

Note: Resource areas with no project-specific impacts are not listed in this table.

LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU Significant and unavoidable

**Table 3-2
Comparison of RPMP Alternatives**

Impact	Proposed Project	North I-80 Site Only	South I-80 Site Only	South Entry Site	Smaller Research Park	Higher Density	No Project Alternative
3.4.2 Agricultural Resources							
RPMP 3.4-4: Implementation of the RPMP would convert approximately 27 acres of prime farmland (as described by the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program) to nonagricultural uses.	S	NI	E	L	E	E	NI
3.4.3 Air Quality							
RPMP 3.4-5: Construction activities at the RPMP site would result in short-term emissions of criteria pollutants.	S	L	L	E	L	L	NI
RPMP 3.4-6: Routine activities at the RPMP site would result in increased levels of operational emissions of criteria pollutants.	PS	L	L	E	L	E	NI
3.4.4 Biological Resources							
RPMP 3.4-7: Implementation of the RPMP would result in the conversion of approximately 38 acres of Agricultural Land and Ruderal/Annual Grassland habitat, potentially suitable for western burrowing owl.	PS	L	L	L	L	L	NI
RPMP 3.4-8: Implementation of the RPMP would result in the loss of potential habitat for the Valley elderberry longhorn beetle.	PS	E	L	E	L	E	NI
RPMP 3.4-9: Implementation of the RPMP could result in the failure of Swainson’s hawk nesting, and in the loss of active nest sites.	PS	L	L	L	L	L	NI
RPMP 3.4-10: Development of a new storm drain outfall for the RPMP at the Arboretum waterway could result in the adverse modification of wetlands or other waters of the U.S. that fall under the jurisdiction of the ACOE and/or CDFG.	PS	E	L	E	L	E	NI

Note : This table lists only the significant and potentially significant impacts of the proposed project.

Abbreviations for Proposed Project: Impacts are: S = Significant (or Potentially Significant) but can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Abbreviations for Alternatives: Impacts are: NI = no impact, L = less than the proposed project; E = roughly equal to the proposed project; M = more significant than the proposed project.

3.0 RESEARCH PARK MASTER PLAN

Impact	Proposed Project	North I-80 Site Only	South I-80 Site Only	South Entry Site	Smaller Research Park	Higher Density	No Project Alternative
RPMP 3.4-11: Development of a new storm drain outfall at the Arboretum waterway for the RPMP could result in the loss of potential habitat for the northwestern pond turtle or otherwise affect the species during construction.	PS	E	NI	NI	NI	E	NI
RPMP 3.4-12: Implementation of the RPMP would result in the removal of trees recognized to meet the campus' standards for Important trees, including: (i) <i>Heritage Trees</i> : healthy valley oak trees with trunk diameters of 33 inches or greater at a height of 54 inches from the ground. (ii) <i>Specimen Trees</i> : healthy trees or stands of trees that are of high value to the campus due to their size, species, extraordinary educational and research value, and/or other exceptional local importance.	PS	E	NI	NI	NI	E	NI
3.4.5 Cultural Resources							
RPMP 3.4-13: Implementation of the RPMP could damage or destroy an archaeological resource or historic building or structure as a result of grading, excavation, ground disturbance, or other project development.	LS	NI	E	NI	E	L	NI
3.4.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials							
RPMP 3.4-14: Implementation of the RPMP could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials.	PS	L	L	E	L	E	NI
RPMP 3.4-15: Implementation of the RPMP could expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated soil or groundwater.	LS	E	E	E	L	E	NI
3.4.14 Traffic, Circulation, and Parking							
RPMP 3.4-20: Implementation of the RPMP would cause unacceptable intersection operations.	S	L	L	E	L	E	NI

Note : This table lists only the significant and potentially significant impacts of the proposed project.

Abbreviations for Proposed Project: Impacts are: S = Significant (or Potentially Significant) but can be mitigated to less-than-significant levels; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Abbreviations for Alternatives: Impacts are: NI = no impact, L = less than the proposed project; E = roughly equal to the proposed project; M = more significant than the proposed project.

**Table 3-3
University of California, Davis
Research Park Master Plan Mitigation Monitoring Program**

Number	Mitigation Measures	Monitoring and Reporting Procedure	Mitigation Timing		Mitigation Responsibility
AIR QUALITY					
RPMP 3.4-6	<i>To reduce NO_x emissions, the campus shall conduct testing of only one of the project's three emergency generators on a given day.</i>	Establish standard operating procedure specifying that only one emergency generator shall be tested on a given day.	OC	Prior to occupancy	Operations & Maintenance
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS					
RPMP 3.4-15	<i>(a) The campus shall require the developer of the RPMP to perform a due diligence investigation that includes a review of past and current uses of the site for activities that may have involved hazardous materials use or hazardous waste disposal.</i>	Include performance of a due diligence investigation in campus agreement with developer.	DE	During project planning phase	Developer, Resource Management & Planning, Environmental Health & Safety
	<i>(b) If the review identifies activities or practices that may have resulted in releases of hazardous materials to the soil or groundwater, the campus will ensure that either the campus or the developer shall conduct additional investigation and remediation as appropriate.</i>	Conduct additional investigation and remediation as necessary.	DE	Prior to construction of RPMP facilities	Developer, Resource Management & Planning, Environmental Health & Safety
TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION					
RPMP 3.4-20	<i>As needed based on the occupancy levels and occupancy dates of each building in the RPMP to maintain adequate levels of service, the campus shall obtain funding for traffic signals at Old Davis Road and I-80.</i>	Monitor traffic levels at Old Davis Road and I-80; verify installation of improvements.	CO	Prior to construction of first facility that would cause LOS to drop below acceptable standards	Resource Management & Planning

Project stage at which implementation of the measure is required: SS=during site selection; DE=during detailed project planning or project design prior to project approval; CO=during construction; OC=prior to occupancy; OP=during operation

3.3 DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.3.1 Project Location

The proposed RPMP addresses development, as part of the overall development of the campus under the 2003 LRDP, of two parcels separated by but adjacent to I-80. The development would include an approximately 11-acre parcel west of Old Davis Road and north of I-80 and an approximately 27-acre parcel west of Old Davis Road and south of I-80 (see Figure 3-1). The Research Park that would be developed at this location pursuant to the RPMP is referred to in this EIR as the RPMP project.

3.3.2 Project Needs and Objectives

The RPMP is designed to create new facilities to accommodate and encourage the growing private, public, and University research relationships at UC Davis. The proposed RPMP project would provide space on campus for a variety of private, public, and nonprofit organizations that have research affiliations with UC Davis. The RPMP project may also include facilities occupied by UC Davis programs.

Completing the Research Park initiative would enhance the ability of UC Davis to recruit outstanding faculty and researchers, and it would expand the range of educational, internship, and employment opportunities for students in proximity to the campus.

The specific objectives of the proposed RPMP include the following:

- Encourage research partnerships between UC Davis and private, public, or nonprofit organizations
- Expand the range of educational, internship, employment, and career opportunities in close proximity to the campus core
- Enhance the ability of UC Davis to recruit outstanding faculty and researchers
- Increase the number, breadth, and diversity of professional researchers within the campus community
- Enhance Support of University Research and Education Programs

3.3.3 Planning Process

Planning for a Research Park at UC Davis began in 1994 in response to interest expressed by the faculty and a number of private and public entities engaged in collaborative research with the faculty. The 1994 LRDP and its accompanying EIR (EIP Associates 1994) established three Enterprise Reserve areas, including a 44-acre area on the west campus, a 23-acre I-80 Enterprise Reserve area on both sides of I-80 near the campus south entry, and a 9-acre Aggie Village Reserve. In 1998 a Supplement to the 1994 LRDP EIR was certified¹ by The Board of Regents of the University of California (The Regents), which expanded the I-80 Enterprise Reserve to

¹ 1997-98 Major Capital Improvements Projects Supplemental EIR (EIP Associates 1998).

include an additional 15 acres on the south campus for a total of 38 acres. In 2000-01, a campus task force established goals and objectives for the Research Park program, and in 2001-02, a third-party developer team was selected by the campus to undertake the development of the Research Park. The 2003 LRDP and the RPMP represent a continuation of the Research Park planning process. The 2003 LRDP changes the name of the land use designation from Enterprise Reserve to Research Park. The RPMP proposed a development plan for two of the three parcels that are designated as Research Park on the 2003 LRDP land use diagram.

A third-party developer would construct and operate the RPMP project. However, the University would retain ownership by leasing the land with an approximately 65-year ground lease. The terms of the ground lease would include all of the design criteria, financial obligations, campus policy requirements, and, if necessary, conditions to ensure implementation of any mitigation measures that are identified in the EIR. Tenants for the RPMP project will need UC approval, and the tenant approval process will include selection criteria established by the University.

3.3.4 Description of the Research Park Master Plan

The proposed RPMP addresses the development of Research Park buildings, infrastructure, parking, and landscaping on two parcels with a total area of approximately 38 acres (Figure 3-1).

The RPMP includes a development program for this land as well as planning concepts and design guidelines for the projects that are proposed in the future within the RPMP area. The RPMP includes design guidelines for integrating environmentally efficient systems and technologies into the Research Park facilities that are built at the site. Some elements of these guidelines include design measures to minimize heat gain during the summer months and maximize solar access for winter heat gain and to use energy-efficient HVAC systems and equipment; day lighting concepts such as solar shelves; and energy management systems to reduce electrical demand.

The 11-acre parcel north of I-80 and west of Old Davis Road is prominently located at the southern entry of the campus. The proposed development on this parcel would include one or two two-story buildings that would total 135,000 gsf. Approximately 67,500 gsf of this space would be laboratories, about 45,000 gsf of which would be wet laboratories. The remaining space would be used for offices. Development on this parcel would also include parking and 5 acres of landscaping (described in detail below). Vehicular access would be from Old Davis Road via a two-lane driveway.

The 27-acre parcel south of I-80 is a triangular parcel bounded by Old Davis Road on the east, I-80 to the north, a water reservoir to the west, and a field road to the south. The land is currently undeveloped and is not being used. The new development on this parcel under the RPMP would include approximately 345,000 gsf in five to six two-story buildings ranging from 60,000 gsf to 75,000 gsf each. Approximately 173,000 gsf of the total space would be laboratories, about 115,000 gsf of which would be wet laboratory space. The remaining 172,000 gsf would be used for offices. The southern parcel also would include surface parking adjacent to the buildings and approximately 11.5 acres of landscaping. Access would be from Old Davis Road, and an entry park would define the interior of the southern parcel. Potential components of the southern site include a café, a shaded outdoor dining area, water feature, informal landscaped gathering areas, sports court, and pedestrian paths linking all buildings.