

# **CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL EIR, FINDINGS, AND APPROVAL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS 2003 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

## **I. CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL EIR**

The University of California (“University”), as lead agency, has completed the Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2003 Long Range Development Plan (“2003 LRDP”) for the University of California, Davis (“UC Davis” or “the campus”). The Final Environmental Impact Report (“Final EIR”) has been assigned State Clearinghouse No. 2002102092.

Volumes I and II of the October 2003 Final EIR assess the potential environmental effects of implementation of the 2003 LRDP, identify means to eliminate or reduce potential adverse impacts, and evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives to the 2003 LRDP as proposed. Volume III of Final EIR assesses the potential environmental effects of five projects proposed by UC Davis for implementation under the 2003 LRDP. Volume IV of the Final EIR includes comments on the May 2003 Draft EIR submitted by interested public agencies, organizations and members of the public, and provides written responses to the environmental issues raised in those comments. The Final EIR is hereby incorporated in these findings by reference. Approval of design, site development and infrastructure for each these five projects is being addressed in a separate action of The Regents and/or University officials delegated such authority pursuant to the Standing Orders and Bylaws of The Regents of the University of California.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 15090, the Board of Regents of the University of California (“The Regents”) certifies that it has been presented with the Final EIR and that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to making the following certifications and the findings in Section II and the approvals in Section III, below.

The Regents is certifying the Final EIR for the entirety of the actions described in these findings and in the Final EIR as comprising the 2003 LRDP for UC Davis.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15090 (Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Section 15090) The Regents certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and the State CEQA Guidelines.

The Regents further certifies that the Final EIR satisfies the requirements for a long range development plan EIR prepared under Public Resources Code Section 21080.09 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15081.5.

The Regents further certifies that the Final EIR reflects its independent judgment and analysis of The Regents. The Final EIR evaluates the potential impacts of the 2003 LRDP at a program level.

Based upon the foregoing, The Regents finds and determines that as the certified Environmental Impact Report for the 2003 LRDP, the Final EIR provides the basis for approval

of the 2003 LRDP, and the supporting findings set forth in Section II below. In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.09, such further review as may be required under the provisions of CEQA for implementation of projects implementing the 2003 LRDP shall be based upon the Final EIR or a tiered analysis based upon the Final EIR.

The Regents further finds and determines that the Final EIR shall serve as the basis for compliance with CEQA for all discretionary actions by other state and local agencies necessary to implementation of the 2003 LRDP, including projects implementing the 2003 LRDP. Discretionary actions taken by state or local agencies acting as responsible or trustee agencies under CEQA with respect to the 2003 LRDP and projects implementing the 2003 LRDP, shall be based upon the Final EIR together with any tiered analysis as may be prepared by the University based upon the Final EIR for such projects.

## **II. FINDINGS**

The Regents is adopting these findings for the entirety of the actions described in these findings and in the Final EIR as comprising the 2003 LRDP for UC Davis.

Approvals of projects contemplated by the 2003 LRDP will be made by The Regents and/or University officials delegated such authority pursuant to the Standing Orders and Bylaws of The Regents of the University of California.

Having received, reviewed and considered the Final EIR and other information in the record of proceedings, The Regents hereby adopts the following findings in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the University's procedures for implementing CEQA:

Part A: Findings regarding the environmental review process and the contents of the Final EIR.

Part B: Findings regarding impacts and disposition of related mitigation measures.

Part C: Findings regarding the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Part D: Findings regarding alternatives to the project and the reasons that such alternatives have been rejected.

Part E: Statement of Overriding Considerations determining that the benefits of the project outweigh the significant and unavoidable environmental impacts that will result and therefore justify approval of the project despite such impacts.

The Regents certifies that these findings are based on full appraisal of all viewpoints, including all comments received up to the date of adoption of these findings, concerning the environmental issues identified and discussed in the Final EIR. The Regents adopts these findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the approvals set forth in Section III, below.

**A. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS**

**1. Development of the Proposed 2003 LRDP**

In September 1994, The Regents adopted the 1994 LRDP for UC Davis as a guide for the physical development in support of campus needs and goals and campus population growth projected through 2005-06. As of academic year 2001-02, the campus was within the projected overall enrollment and employee growth levels established by the 1994 LRDP. However, the University of California projects that system-wide, full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment will increase by approximately 63,000 from 1998 through 2010. Therefore, in January 2000, the University of California's Office of the President asked each UC campus to consider the feasibility of implementing campus-specific enrollment targets. As a result, UC Davis has prepared a new LRDP (2003 LRDP) to plan for anticipated growth through 2015-2016.

**2. Environmental Review Process**

An Initial Study and Environmental Impact Report were prepared for the 2003 LRDP in accordance with CEQA and the University of California Procedures for Implementation of CEQA.

The campus published a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") and Initial Study indicating that an EIR would be prepared for the 2003 LRDP, in October 2002. The public and agency review of the NOP and Initial Study extended from October 21, 2002 through November 20, 2002. Responses to comments on the NOP and Initial Study are included in Appendix A of the Final EIR.

The Notice of Completion and Draft EIR for the project were published on May 5, 2003 (SCH #2002102092). The official public notice announcing: (1) the availability of the Draft EIR for review and comment by the public and agencies; (2) the date and location of a public hearing on the EIR; and (3) how to obtain copies of the EIR, appeared in The Davis Enterprise, the local paper of public record, on April 28, 2003. The initial public and agency review period extended from May 5, 2003 through July 3, 2003. On July 3, 2003, the campus issued an official public notice announcing that, in response to requests from the public, the campus had elected to extend the comment period through August 3, 2003. During that time, the Draft EIR was reviewed by various governmental agencies, as well as interested individuals and organizations. Postcards were sent to over 3,000 West Davis neighbors providing notice of the extended comment period. One hundred fifty five letters were received during the public review period and were considered by UC Davis. In addition, members of the public were invited by formal public notice to submit comments on the Draft EIR in testimony at public hearings held for that purpose on June 2 and July 28, 2003. Twelve persons provided comments on the Draft EIR at the public hearings.

The Final EIR contains all of the comments received during the public comment period, including a transcript of the public meetings, together with written responses to those comments which were prepared in accordance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the

University's procedures for implementing CEQA. The Regents finds and determines that the Final EIR provides adequate, good faith and reasoned responses to all comments raising significant environmental issues.

### **3. Absence of Significant New Information**

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 requires a lead agency to recirculate an EIR for further review and comment when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR but before certification. New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect that the project proponent declines to implement. The Guidelines provide examples of significant new information under this standard. Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.

The Regents recognizes that the Final EIR incorporates information obtained by the University since the Draft EIR was completed, and contains additions, clarifications, modifications and other changes as follows:

*Changes to the 2003 LRDP.* The changes to the proposed 2003 LRDP are discussed in detail in Section 2, Volume IV of the Final EIR, and include the following:

- Refinements in the details of circulation and site layout at the South Entry to the central campus as the result of progress in design for the Robert Mondavi Institute;
- Minor changes to the acreages of land under various land use categories;
- Replacement of the optional vehicular connection from the Neighborhood Master Plan ("NMP") to Russell Boulevard by a roadway connection to Russell Boulevard for emergency vehicles only; improved bicycle and pedestrian connections; and the addition of a pocket park in the NMP;
- Refinements in the design of the detention ponds along the northern margin of the Neighborhood, including the addition of a tree protection buffer;
- Expansion of the area designated for Student Housing along the eastern margin of the NMP, to encompass the northeastern corner of the area previously designated for the Heidrick Western Center for Agricultural Equipment;
- Designation of the Recreation Fields along the southern margin of the NMP for parking uses as well as recreation;
- Elimination of a minor roadway connection to Hutchison Drive near the western end of the Neighborhood;

- Addition of lands on the Kidwell and McConeghy ranches as potential agricultural mitigation sites instead of or in addition to the areas at Russell Ranch that are proposed as the agricultural mitigation site in the Draft EIR.

The Regents finds that these changes and clarifications do not affect the campus population or operations at full implementation of the 2003 LRDP. None of these changes will result in new or more severe environmental impacts. In addition, none of these changes materially change the campus' development footprint or the impacts that will occur due to development within that footprint. As a result, these changes do not require recirculation of the Final EIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

***Changes to Mitigation Measures.*** As described in the Final EIR, a number of the mitigation measures proposed in the Draft EIR have been modified and several new mitigation measures have been added in response to comments received and internal review of the Draft EIR. The Regents finds that these changes and additions to the mitigation measures augment the mitigation proposed in the Draft EIR, strengthen the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures, and enhance their clarity, but do not cause any new environmental impacts, nor have these new mitigation measures been added to address new significant impacts of the project. Therefore, in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, no recirculation of the EIR is necessary based on the change and additions to the mitigation measures in the Final EIR.

***Other Changes.*** Various insignificant modifications have been made to the text, tables and figures of the Draft EIR, as set forth in the Final EIR. These changes are generally of an administrative nature such as correcting typographical errors, making minor adjustments to the data, and adding or changing certain phrases to improve readability. The Regents finds that these changes are of a minor, non-substantive nature and do not require recirculation of the EIR.

Based on the foregoing, and having reviewed the information contained in the Final EIR and in the record of proceedings, including the comments on the Draft EIR and the responses thereto, and the above-described information, The Regents hereby finds that no significant new information has been added to the Final EIR since public notice was given of the availability of the Draft EIR that would require recirculation under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. The new information added to the EIR and referred to above does not involve any new or more severe significant impacts or indicate that the Draft EIR was in any way inadequate or conclusory.

#### **4. Differences of Opinion Regarding the Impacts of the Project**

In making its determination to certify the Final EIR and to approve the project, The Regents recognizes that the project implicates several controversial environmental issues, and that a range of technical and scientific opinion exists with respect to these issues. The Regents has acquired a better understanding of the breadth of this technical and scientific opinion by its review of the Draft EIR, the comments received on the Draft EIR and the responses to those comments. Having reviewed and considered, as a whole, the evidence and analysis presented in the Final EIR, the evidence and analysis presented in the comments on the Draft EIR, the evidence and analysis presented in the responses to those comments, and the

evidence and analysis presented in the Final EIR, The Regents has gained a comprehensive and well-rounded understanding of the environmental issues presented by the proposed project. In turn, this understanding has enabled The Regents to make fully informed, thoroughly considered decisions after taking account of the various viewpoints on these important issues. The Regents accordingly certifies that its findings are based on full appraisal of all viewpoints expressed in the Final EIR, as well as other relevant information in the record of proceedings for the proposed project.

## **B. IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

The following section summarizes the environmental impacts of the project, and includes the findings of The Regents as to those impacts, as required by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of The Regents regarding the environmental impacts of the project, mitigation measures, alternatives to the project and the mitigation measures proposed by the Final EIR and adopted by The Regents as conditions of approval.

These findings summarize the environmental determinations of the Final EIR about project impacts before and after mitigation and do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final EIR. Instead, these findings provide a summary description of each impact, describe the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and adopted by The Regents, and state The Regents' findings on the significance of each impact after imposition of the adopted mitigation measures. A full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Final EIR and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the Final EIR supporting the Final EIR's determinations regarding mitigation measures and the project's impacts. In making these findings, The Regents ratifies, adopts and incorporates the analysis and explanation in the Final EIR in these findings, and ratifies, adopts and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Final EIR relating to mitigation measures and environmental impacts, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

As set forth in Part III, below, The Regents adopts and incorporates as conditions of approval, the mitigation measures set forth in these findings to reduce or avoid the potentially significant and significant impacts of the project, as well as certain less-than-significant impacts. In adopting these mitigation measures, The Regents intends to adopt each of the mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR has inadvertently been omitted from these findings, said mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language of the mitigation measures set forth below fail to accurately reflect the mitigation measures in the Final EIR due to a clerical error, the language of the mitigation measure as set forth in the Final EIR shall control, unless the language of the mitigation measure has been specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

In several comments on the Draft EIR, various measures were suggested by commenters as proposed additional mitigation measures or modifications to the EIR's proposed

mitigation measures. Several mitigation measures were modified in response to such comments, and other mitigation measures were added to the Final EIR in response to such comments. With respect to the additional mitigation proposals contained in comments that were not accepted by the Final EIR, The Regents hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the reasons set forth in the response to comments contained in the Final EIR as its grounds for rejecting adoption of these mitigation measures.

**1. Aesthetics**

- a. *Impact 4.1-1 Scenic Vistas.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would have a significant impact on scenic vistas.

LRDP Mitigation 4.1-1 The Campus Design Review Committee will consider scenic views while planning for projects under the 2003 LRDP to maintain scenic views to the extent feasible. Design considerations could include establishing open landscaping and deciduous trees along important view corridors.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.1-1 will reduce the overall effect of the project on existing scenic vistas; however, this mitigation measure will not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- b. *Impact 4.1-2 Visual Character of the Campus.* Development on campus from implementation of the 2003 LRDP could degrade the visual character of the campus by substantially degrading the valued elements of the visual landscape identified in the 2003 LRDP. This impact would be potentially significant.

LRDP Mitigation 4.1-2(a) New structures, roads, and landscaping at UC Davis shall be designed to be compatible with the visual elements and policies identified in the 2003 LRDP.

LRDP Mitigation 4.1-2(b) Prior to design approval of development projects under the 2003 LRDP, the Campus Design Review Committee must determine that project designs are consistent with the valued elements of the visual landscape identified in the 2003 LRDP, applicable planning guidelines, and the character of surrounding development so that the visual character and quality of the project area are not substantially degraded.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.1-2(a) and 4.1-2(b) will reduce the potentially significant impact on visual character and quality to a less-than-significant level.**

- c. *Impact 4.1-3 Light and Glare.* The impact of light and glare created by development under the 2003 LRDP is potentially significant impact to day or nighttime views.

LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(a) Design for specific projects shall provide for the use of textured nonreflective exterior surfaces and nonreflective glass.

LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(b) Except as provided in LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(c), all new outdoor lighting shall utilize directional lighting methods with shielded and cutoff type light fixtures to minimize glare and upward directed lighting.

LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(c) Non-cutoff, non-shielded lighting fixtures used to enhance nighttime views of walking paths, specific landscape features, or specific architectural features shall be reviewed by the Campus Design Review Committee prior to installation to ensure that: (1) the minimum amount of required lighting is proposed to achieve the desired nighttime emphasis, and (2) the proposed illumination creates no adverse effect on nighttime views.

LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(d) The campus will implement the use of the specified lighting design and equipment when older lighting fixtures and designs are replaced over time.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.1-3(a), 4.1-3(b), 4.1-3(c), and 4.1-3(d) will reduce the potentially significant impact associated with light and glare to a less-than-significant level.**

- d. *Impact 4.1-4 Impact on Scenic Vistas--Cumulative.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP, together with cumulative development in the vicinity, would have a significant impact on scenic vistas.

LRDP Mitigation 4.1-4(a) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.1-1.

LRDP Mitigation 4.1-4(b) The City of Davis, Yolo County, and Solano County can and should implement the General Plan policies that support the long-term establishment and preservation of scenic vistas.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.1-1 and 4.1-4(b) of the Final EIR will reduce the overall effect on existing scenic vistas of the project in conjunction with other regional development; however, these mitigation measures will not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- e. Impact 4.1-5 Impact on Visual Character and Quality--Cumulative.* The cumulative impact on visual character and quality resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP, in conjunction with other development in the region, would be significant.

LRDP Mitigation 4.1-5(a) Implement LRDP mitigations 4.1-2(a) and 4.1-2(b).

LRDP Mitigation 4.1-5(b) The cities of Davis, Woodland, Winters, and Dixon and Yolo and Solano counties can and should implement policies in their plans that address the protection of scenic resources and maintenance of visual quality.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.1-5(a) and 4.1-5(b) will reduce the overall effect of the project, in conjunction with other development in the region, on the visual character or quality in the region. However, the feasibility and/or implementation of the mitigation cannot be guaranteed by the University of California because enforcement and monitoring fall within other jurisdictions. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- f. Impact 4.1-6 Light and Glare Impact--Cumulative.* Light and glare created by implementation of the 2003 LRDP, together with other development in the region, would have a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.1-6(a) Implement LRDP mitigation 4.1-3(a) and 4.1-3(b).

LRDP Mitigation 4.1-6(b) The City of Davis and other surrounding jurisdictions can and should adopt (if necessary) and implement development standards and guidelines which support the minimal use of site lighting for new developments.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.1-6(a) and 4.1-6(b) will reduce the overall effect of light and glare from the project in conjunction with cumulative development. However, the feasibility and/or implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.1-6(b) cannot be guaranteed by the University of California because enforcement and monitoring fall within other jurisdictions. For this reason, the impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

## 2. Agricultural Resources

- a. *Impact 4.2-1 Conversion of Prime Farmland.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would have a significant impact on prime farmland.

LRDP Mitigation 4.2-1 Prior to conversion of prime farmland to nonagricultural uses under the 2003 LRDP, the campus shall preserve approximately 525 acres of prime farmland at Russell Ranch, within the area designated for Teaching and Research Fields, or at the Kidwell or McConeghy parcels, for agricultural purposes (including agricultural teaching and research). The campus will preserve prime farmland at a one-to-one (1:1) mitigation ratio for prime farmland converted to developed uses and a one-third-to-one (1/3:1) ratio for prime farmland converted to habitat at Russell Ranch.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.2-1 will reduce the overall effect of the project on prime farmland; however, this mitigation measure will not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- b. *Impact 4.2-2 Indirect Impact on Conversion of Agricultural Land.* The potential for implementation of the 2003 LRDP to indirectly result in the conversion of agricultural land is a less than significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for implementation of the 2003 LRDP to indirectly result in the conversion of agricultural land to nonagricultural uses is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- c. *Impact 4.2-3 Conversion of Prime Farmland--Cumulative.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP, in conjunction with other development in the region, would have a significant impact on prime farmland.

LRDP Mitigation 4.2-3 Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.2-1.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.2-3 will reduce the overall effect of the project, in conjunction with other regional development, on prime farmland. However, this mitigation measure will not reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. For this reason, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

### 3. Air Quality

- a. *Impact 4.3-1 Increased Air Emissions.* The increase in daily operational emissions that would result from implementation of the 2003 LRDP is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.3-1(a) Vehicular Sources. The following measures will be implemented to reduce emissions from vehicles, as feasible.

- The campus shall continue to actively pursue Transportation Demand Management to reduce reliance on private automobiles for travel to and from the campus.
- Provide pedestrian-enhancing infrastructure to encourage pedestrian activity and discourage vehicle use.
- Provide bicycle facilities to encourage bicycle use instead of driving.
- Provide transit-enhancing infrastructure to promote the use of public transportation.
- Provide facilities to accommodate alternative-fuel vehicles such as electric cars and CNG vehicles.
- Improve traffic flows and congestion by timing of traffic signals to facilitate uninterrupted travel.
- When the campus purchases new vehicles, the campus will evaluate the practicality and feasibility of acquiring low-pollution vehicles that are appropriate for the task and will purchase these types of vehicles when practical and feasible. When replacing diesel engines in existing equipment, the campus will install up-to-date technology.

LRDP Mitigation 4.3-1(b) Area Sources. The following measures will be implemented to reduce emissions from area sources, as feasible.

- Use solar or low-emission water heaters in new or renovated buildings.
- Orient buildings to take advantage of solar heating and natural cooling and use passive solar designs.
- Increase wall and attic insulation in new or renovated buildings.
- For fireplaces or wood-burning appliances, require low-emitting EPA certified wood-burning appliances, or residential natural-gas fireplaces.
- Provide electric equipment for landscape maintenance.

LRDP Mitigation 4.3-1(c) The campus will work with the YSAQMD to ensure that emissions directly and indirectly associated with the campus are adequately accounted for and mitigated in applicable air quality planning efforts. The YSAQMD can and should adopt adequate measures consistent with applicable law to ensure that air quality standard violations are avoided.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.3-1(a), 4.3-1(b), and 4.3-1(c) will reduce the overall effect of the increase in daily operational emissions resulting from**

**implementation of the project; however, it is unlikely that these emissions could be lowered to levels that would be considered less than significant. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- b. *Impact 4.3-2 Impact of CO Emissions Associated with Vehicular Traffic.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not contribute substantially to a violation of CO standards or expose receptors to substantial CO concentrations associated with vehicular traffic. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for implementation of the 2003 LRDP to contribute substantially to a violation of CO standards or expose receptors to substantial CO concentrations associated with vehicular traffic is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- c. *Impact 4.3-3 Increased Air Emissions from Construction Activities.* The increase in air emissions from construction activities associated with the 2003 LRDP is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.3-3(a) The campus shall include in all construction contracts the measures specified below to reduce fugitive dust impacts, including but not limited to the following:

- All disturbed areas, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purpose, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, or vegetative ground cover.
- All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.
- All land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled of fugitive dust emissions utilizing application of water or by presoaking.
- When demolishing buildings up to six stories in height, all exterior surfaces of the building shall be wetted during demolition.
- When materials are transported off-site, all material shall be covered, effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, or at least two feet of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained.
- All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at least once every 24 hours when operations are occurring. The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions. Use of blower devices also is expressly forbidden.

- Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of outdoor storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emissions by utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.

LRDP Mitigation 4.3-3(b) The campus shall include in construction contracts for large construction projects near receptors, the following control measures:

- Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.
- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than one percent.
- To the extent feasible, limit area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activity at any one time.

LRDP Mitigation 4.3-3(c) The campus shall implement the following control measures to reduce emissions of ozone precursors from construction equipment exhaust:

- To the extent that equipment is available and cost effective, the campus shall encourage contractors to use alternate fuels and retrofit existing engines in construction equipment.
- Minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes when construction equipment is not in use.
- To the extent practicable, manage operation of heavy-duty equipment to reduce emissions.
- To the extent practicable, employ construction management techniques such as timing construction to occur outside the ozone season of May through October, or scheduling equipment use to limit unnecessary concurrent operation.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.3-3(a), 4.3-3(b), and 4.3-3(c) will reduce the overall effect of air emissions from construction activities associated with the 2003 LRDP; however, these mitigation measures may not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- d. Impact 4.3-4 Objectionable Odors.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not create objectionable odors that could affect a substantial number of persons. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for implementation of the 2003 LRDP to create objectionable odors is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- e. Impact 4.3-5 Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not expose campus occupants and other populations in

the vicinity of the campus to substantial air toxics concentrations. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that exposure to toxic air contaminants resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- f. Impact 4.3-6 Increase in Non-Attainment Pollutants--Cumulative.*  
Implementation of the 2003 LRDP, in conjunction with other regional development, would result in a cumulatively considerable increase of non-attainment pollutants. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.3-6 Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.3-1(a), 4.3-1(b), and 4.3-1(c).

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.3-1(a), 4.3-1(b), and 4.3-1(c) will reduce the overall effect of the increase in non-attainment pollutants resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP in conjunction with other development in the region; however, these mitigation measures will not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- g. Impact 4.3-7 Increase in CO Concentrations--Cumulative.*  
Implementation of the 2003 LRDP, in conjunction with other regional development, would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable increase in CO concentrations or expose receptors to substantial CO concentrations. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the increase in CO concentrations resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP in conjunction with other development in the region, is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- h. Impact 4.3-8 Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants--Cumulative.* Regional growth could result in an increase in toxic air contaminants if compensating technological improvements are not implemented. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.3-8 EPA and CARB are expected to continue the development and implementation of programs to reduce air toxics, and UC Davis will continue its efforts in this area.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.3-8 will reduce the impact of the 2003 LRDP**

**in conjunction with other regional development, associated with exposure to toxic air contaminants to a less-than-significant level.**

**4. Biological Resources**

- a. *Impact 4.4-1 Loss of Special-Status Plant Species.* The impact of development under the 2003 LRDP on special-status plant species is potentially significant.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-1(a) During the project planning phase, the campus shall conduct a rare plant survey if the site was previously undeveloped and is in a valley-foothill riparian, open water pond, riverine, wetland or ruderal/annual grassland or habitat. Surveys shall be conducted by qualified biologists in accordance with the most current CDFG/USFWS guidelines or protocols and shall be conducted during the blooming period of the plant species with potential to occur in the area, as listed in Table 4.4-2 of the EIR. If these surveys reveal no occurrences of any species, then no further mitigation would be required.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-1(b) Should surveys determine that special-status plant species are present, measures will be taken to avoid the plants and the associated habitat necessary for long-term maintenance of the population. If avoidance is not feasible the campus will provide off-site compensation at a 1:1 ratio. Off-site compensation will include preservation of existing populations at other sites and/or enhancement of the affected species. The campus will preserve either an equal number of the affected plants or an equal area of the affected species habitat. The campus shall also develop and fund the implementation of a plan to manage and monitor the preserve to ensure the long-term survival of the preserved population.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.4-1(a) and 4.4-1(b) will reduce the potentially significant impact on special-status plant species to a less-than-significant level.**

- b. *Impact 4.4-2 Loss of Foraging Habitat for Swainson's Hawk.* Development allowed under the 2003 LRDP would result in the loss of general wildlife habitat for resident and migratory species, including foraging habitat for the Swainson's hawk. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-2 The campus shall mitigate the loss of foraging habitat due to development through the establishment of 650 acres of mitigation lands located within or near the Putah Creek Riparian Reserve. Approximately 370 acres of this area shall be converted from existing agricultural uses to restored Valley-Foothill Riparian Woodland and Valley Grassland at Russell Ranch. An additional 280 acres of agricultural land will be protected with a habitat and farmland conservation mechanism either at Russell Ranch or the Kidwell and McConeghy parcels. These grassland and agricultural lands would be available as foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk and other special-status species such as

prairie falcon, golden eagle, wintering or migrating birds and birds of prey that may occasionally forage on campus lands. Restored Valley-Foothill Riparian Habitat would be available as nesting habitat for Swainson's hawk and other birds of prey.

An additional 15-acre mitigation area shall be established along the North Fork Cutoff. This area shall be restored as an oak-grassland and would be a nesting and foraging site for Swainson's hawk and other birds of prey.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.4-2 will reduce the potentially significant impact on foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk to a less-than-significant level.**

- c. *Impact 4.4-3 Impact on Burrowing Owl Habitat.* Development under the 2003 LRDP would result in the conversion of habitat suitable for burrowing owls. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-3(a) The Russell Ranch Mitigation Area shall include 195 acres of grassland habitat suitable for use by burrowing owls. Ground squirrels in the mitigation area shall not be subject to control measures and will be allowed to fluctuate in response to local conditions. Artificial burrows may be installed if ground squirrel populations are not providing a sufficient number of burrows to support burrowing owls.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-3(b) The campus shall survey proposed development areas with potential habitat for the presence or absence of burrowing owls.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-3(c) The campus, shall conduct a pre-construction survey of proposed project sites during the breeding season (from approximately February 1 through August 31), consistent with CDFG guidelines, during the same calendar year that construction is planned to begin. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if any burrowing owls are nesting on or directly adjacent to any proposed project site. If phased construction procedures are planned for the proposed project, the results of the above survey shall be valid only for the season when it is conducted. If the pre-construction breeding season survey does not identify any nesting raptor species on the project site, then no further mitigation would be required. However, should any burrowing owls be found nesting on the project site, then LRDP Mitigation 4.4-3(d) shall be implemented.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-3(d) During the breeding season, the campus, consistent with CDFG guidelines, shall not disturb an occupied burrowing owl burrow while there is an active nest and/or juvenile owls are present. Avoidance shall include the establishment of a non-disturbance buffer zone around the nest site consistent with CDFG guidelines. The buffer zone shall be delineated by highly visible temporary construction fencing. The occupied nest site shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to determine when the juvenile owl is fledged and independent. Disturbance of an occupied burrow shall only occur outside of the breeding season and when there is no nest or juvenile owl based on monitoring by a CDFG-approved biologist.

Based on approval by CDFG, pre-construction and pre-breeding season exclusion measures may be implemented to preclude burrowing owl occupation of the project site prior to project-related disturbance. These include the following measures:

- Obviously inactive burrows in the project area will be closed. Active or potentially active ground squirrel burrows will be monitored to confirm use by ground squirrels and not by burrowing owls before ground squirrels are removed and the burrow is closed. One-way doors will be used on active burrows if use by ground squirrels cannot be confirmed.
- Where feasible, artificial burrows will be provided in adjacent suitable habitat consistent with CDFG guidelines.
- The owls will be displaced from the occupied burrows according to the CDFG burrowing owl guidelines. The owls will be displaced from their burrows by installing one-way exit doors in occupied or potential burrows within the area of disturbance. After 48 hours with the doors in place, the burrows will then be closed to prevent reoccupation by owls.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.4-3(a), 4.4-3(b), 4.4-3(c), and 4.4-3(d) will reduce the potentially significant impact on burrowing owl habitat to a less-than-significant level.**

- d. *Impact 4.4-4 Failure of Swainson's Hawk Nesting Efforts.* Development under the 2003 LRDP could result in the failure of nesting efforts by Swainson's hawk or other birds of prey. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-4(a) The campus shall conduct a pre-construction survey of trees on and adjacent to a project site during the raptor breeding season (approximately March 1 to August 31). Additionally, the campus shall conduct surveys within a ½-mile radius of the site to determine the presence or absence of any nesting Swainson's hawks. The surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the same calendar year that the proposed activity is planned to begin to determine if any nesting birds-of-prey would be affected. If phased construction procedures are planned for the proposed activity, the results of the above survey shall be valid only for the season when it is conducted.

If any Swainson's hawks are nesting within a one-half-mile radius of the project site or if other raptors are nesting in, on or adjacent to the project site, a qualified biologist shall determine the potential for disturbance to nesting Swainson's hawks. If the biologist determines that there is a significant potential for disturbance, the campus shall implement feasible changes in the construction schedule or make other appropriate adjustments to the project in response to the specific circumstances. If feasible project changes are not readily identifiable, the campus will consult with CDFG to determine what actions should be taken to protect the nesting efforts.

If, after five years, a previously recorded nest site remains unoccupied by a Swainson's hawk, it will no longer be considered as a Swainson's hawk nest site subject to this mitigation.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-4(b) The campus shall continue to conduct annual surveys to determine the location of nesting Swainson's hawks and other birds of prey on the campus outside the Putah Creek corridor. If nesting Swainson's hawks are found during the survey at a previously unknown location within one-half mile of a project site and/or at a location closer to the project or more visually exposed to the project site than a nearby previously documented site, a qualified biologist shall, prior to project construction, determine the potential for disturbance to nesting Swainson's hawks. If the biologist determines that there is a significant potential for disturbance, the campus shall implement feasible changes in the construction schedule or make other appropriate adjustments to the project in response to the specific circumstances (e.g., relocating noisy equipment or creating temporary sound barriers).

The implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.4-4(a) and (b) shall be conducted under the supervision of a biologist whose qualifications include:

- A bachelor's degree in biology or a related field;
- Two years of field experience related to nesting raptors; and
- Prior construction monitoring experience.

Further:

- All decisions of the qualified biologist shall be made in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game;
- Monitoring shall be conducted for a sufficient time (minimum of 3 consecutive days following the initiation of construction) to verify that the nesting pair does not exhibit significant adverse reaction to construction activities (i.e., changes in behavioral patterns, reactions to construction noise, etc.); and
- Nest site monitoring will continue for a minimum of once a week through the nesting cycle at that nest.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.4-4(a) and 4.4-4(b) will reduce the potentially significant impact associated with the failure of nesting efforts by Swainson's hawks or other birds of prey to a less-than-significant level.**

- e. Impact 4.4-5 Loss of Nest Trees for Swainson's Hawk.* Development allowed under the 2003 LRDP would result in the loss of nest trees for the Swainson's hawk. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-5 Mitigation 4.4-4(a) and 4.4-4(b) will be implemented, including pre-construction survey of trees on and adjacent to a project site during the raptor breeding season (approximately March 1 to August 31). If a Swainson's hawk nest tree is present, the tree will be removed outside the nesting season (March-May).

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.4-5 will reduce the potentially significant impact associated with loss of nest trees for the Swainson's hawk to a less-than-significant level.**

- f. *Impact 4.4-6 Loss of Potential Habitat for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (VELB).* Development allowed under the 2003 LRDP would result in the loss of potential habitat for the VELB, which would be a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-6(a) During the project design stage and as a condition of project approval, the campus shall:

- Conduct a project-specific survey for all potential VELB habitat, including a stem count and an assessment of historic or current VELB use; and
- Avoid and protect all potential VELB habitat within a natural open space area where feasible.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-6(b) For those areas where avoidance is infeasible, the Russell Ranch Mitigation Area shall include approximately 20 acres within and adjacent to the riparian corridor of Putah Creek and within and adjacent to the existing drainage in the northeast corner of the site that will be used as a receptor site for transplanted elderberry shrubs and the associated elderberry seedlings and other native plant seedlings required to be planted in accordance with the USFWS VELB Mitigation Guidelines (USFWS 1996). The site is estimated to support between 100 and 500 transplanted elderberry shrubs, depending on the size and number of stems on the shrubs at the time they are transplanted.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.4-6(a) and 4.4-6(b) will reduce the potentially significant impact associated with loss of potential VELB habitat to a less-than-significant level.**

- g. *Impact 4.4-7 Impact on Northwestern Pond Turtle.* Development allowed under the 2003 LRDP could result in the loss of potential habitat for the northwestern pond turtle. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-7 The campus shall implement avoidance and minimization measures for the northwestern pond turtle, including but not limited to:

- Pre-construction surveys prior to any disturbance of the project site.

- Installation of silt fencing to prevent any pond turtles from entering the construction area.
- If work is performed in the water, seining of the area surrounding the site to relocate any northwestern pond turtles present.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.4-7 will reduce the potentially significant impact on potential habitat for the northwestern pond turtle to a less-than-significant level.**

- h. Impact 4.4-8 Impact on Wetlands.* Development allowed under the 2003 LRDP could result in the loss or adverse modification of natural wetlands or other waters of the U.S. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-8(a) During the project design phase, the campus shall conduct a wetlands delineation of the project site if wetlands are potentially present. The wetland delineation shall be verified by the ACOE.

Should no wetland habitats or natural drainages be delineated on the site then no further mitigation shall be required. However, if any jurisdictional wetland habitats or natural drainages are delineated on a project site, then LRDP Mitigation 4.4-8(b) shall be required.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-8(b) For projects that involve the fill of jurisdictional wetlands, the campus shall implement the following mitigation program that will ensure no net loss of wetland functions and values. To the extent feasible, the campus will avoid filling wetlands by redesigning the project to promote environmentally sensitive siting and design. If avoidance is not feasible, the campus shall minimize the fill acreage. If neither of these options is feasible, the wetlands will be mitigated for at a 3:1 ratio. This ratio will include both creation and preservation, with creation equaling at least a 1:1 ratio. To ensure no net loss of wetlands, the mitigation should include wetland enhancement as well. This would include monitoring, cleanup, and maintenance of preserved wetland habitats within and adjacent to the campus, as necessary.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-8(c) The campus shall obtain the necessary ACOE, CDFG, and RWQCB permits prior to filling or other adverse modifications of any verified jurisdictional water of the U.S., or alteration, filling or modification of the channel, bed or bank of Putah Creek, South Fork of Putah Creek, Arboretum Waterway or any other natural drainage regulated under Section 1600 of the CDFG code.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.4-8(a), 4.4-8(b), and 4.4-8(c) will reduce the potentially significant impact on wetlands to a less-than-significant level.**

- i. *Impact 4.4-9 Impact on Wildlife Corridors or Nursery Sites.* Development of the 2003 LRDP would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish, or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for implementation of the 2003 LRDP to interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish, or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- j. *Impact 4.4-10 Impact on Special Status Fish Species.* Development under the 2003 LRDP could potentially result in an adverse effect on special status fish species in Putah Creek. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-10(a) Any work conducted within the creek will be constructed outside of the migration season (September 1 and October 15) to the extent feasible.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-10(b) If construction activities are to be conducted in the water during the migration season:

- Silt curtains will be used at the construction location.
- Water quality will be evaluated during and after all in-water construction activities. The performance criteria shall be no degradation of downstream water quality compared to upstream water quality. Water quality shall be evaluated by a qualified environmental monitor using appropriate qualitative or quantitative measurements. Remedial measures shall be implemented if downstream water quality is degraded. Remedial measures shall include the following:
  - Modification or suspension of in-water construction activities as appropriate;
  - Installation of additional sediment control devices; and
  - Additional monitoring to evaluate the water quality degradation and identify corrective measures.
- The University shall coordinate with the California Department of Fish and Game, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as appropriate to determine whether additional remedial measures are required.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-10(c) Silt fencing shall be installed as appropriate along the edges of the creek to prevent excess fill from entering the water. All silt fences shall be maintained and checked for efficacy as necessary, but not less frequently than one time per week.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.4-10(a), 4.4-10(b), and 4.4-10(c) will reduce the potentially significant impact on special-status fish species to a less-than-significant level.**

- k. Impact 4.4-11 Removal of Important Trees.* Development under the 2003 LRDP could result in the removal of trees recognized to meet the campus' standards for important trees, including Heritage Trees and Specimen Trees. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-11 Before a project is approved under the 2003 LRDP, the campus will perform a tree survey of the project site. Grounds, the Office of Resource Management and Planning, and the Office of Architects and Engineers will provide input about tree classifications and will modify project design to avoid important trees if feasible. If a project cannot avoid an important tree, the following will apply:

- a If a project would necessitate removal of a Heritage Tree, no mitigation would be available to fully mitigate the impact, and the impact would be significant and unavoidable. However, implementation of Mitigation 4.4-2 would restore Valley Riparian Woodland habitat at Russell Ranch, and plantings in this area would include valley oaks.
- b If a project would necessitate removal of a Specimen Tree, the project would relocate the tree if feasible, or would replace the tree with the same species or species of comparable value (relocation or replacement should occur within the project area if feasible).

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.4-11 will reduce the overall effect of the project on Specimen Trees to a less-than-significant level. However, this mitigation will not reduce the impact on Heritage Trees to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- l. Impact 4.4-12 Loss of Swainson's Hawk and Burrowing Owl Habitat--Cumulative.* The loss of habitat for resident and migratory wildlife species including Swainson's hawks and burrowing owls resulting from development allowed under the 2003 LRDP in conjunction with other development in the region is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-12 Implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.4-1(a), (b), and (c); 4.4-2(a) and (b); 4.4-3(a) and (b); and 4.4-7(a) in combination with the Yolo County NCCP and Solano County HCP, including compliance with the regulatory and permitting requirements imposed by the USFWS and the CDFG.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.4-12 will reduce the overall effect on habitat for Swainson's hawks and burrowing owls that would result from the project in conjunction with other development in the region. However, the University of California cannot guarantee the implementation of the Yolo County NCCP and Solano County HCP. For this reason, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- m. Impact 4.4-13 Impact on Wetlands and Riparian Habitat--Cumulative.* Development allowed under the 2003 LRDP could contribute to the cumulative loss of wetland and riparian habitat for resident and migratory wildlife species and special status plants in the region. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-13 Implementation of LRDP Mitigation Measures 4.4-1(a)-(b) and 4.4-8(a)-(c) in combination with the Yolo County NCCP and Solano County HCP, including compliance with the regulatory and permitting requirements imposed by the USFWS and the CDFG.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.4-13 will reduce the overall effect on wetlands and riparian habitat that would result from the project in conjunction with other development in the region. However, the University of California cannot guarantee the implementation of the Yolo County NCCP and Solano County HCP. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- n. Impact 4.4-14 Impact on VELB Habitat--Cumulative.* Development allowed under the 2003 LRDP could contribute to the cumulative loss of VELB habitat. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-14 Implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.4-6(a) and (b), in combination with the Yolo County NCCP and Solano County HCP, including compliance with the regulatory and permitting requirements imposed by the USFWS and the CDFG.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.4-14 will reduce the overall effect on VELB habitat would result from the project in conjunction with other development in the**

**region. However, the University of California cannot guarantee the implementation of the Yolo County NCCP and Solano County HCP. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- o. Impact 4.4-15 Impact on Special Status Fish Species--Cumulative.* Development under the 2003 LRDP would not contribute to a cumulative adverse impact on special status fish species. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that contribution of development under the 2003 LRDP to a cumulative adverse impact on special status fish species is less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

## **5. Cultural Resources**

- a. Impact 4.5-1 Damage or Destruction of an Archaeological Resource or Historic Building or Structure.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could damage or destroy an archaeological resource or historic building or structure as the result of grading, excavation, ground disturbance or other project development. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(a) As early as possible in the project planning process, the campus shall define the project's area of potential effects (APE) for archaeological resources and, if structures are present on the site, for historic structures. The campus shall determine the potential for the project to result in cultural resource impacts, based on the extent of ground disturbance and site modification anticipated for the proposed project. Based on this information, the campus shall:

- (i) Prepare an inventory of all buildings and structures within the APE that will be 50 years of age or older at the time of project construction for review by a qualified architectural historian. If no structures are present on the site, there would be no impact to historic built environment resources from the project. If potentially historic structures are present, LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(c) shall be implemented.
- (ii) Determine the level of archaeological investigation that is appropriate for the project site and activity, as follows:
  - Minimum: excavation less than 18 inches deep and in a relatively small area (e.g., a trench for lawn irrigation, tree planting, etc.). Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(b)(i).
  - Moderate: excavation below 18 inches deep and/or over a large area on any site that has not been characterized and is not suspected to be a

likely location for archaeological resources. Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1 (b)(i) and (ii).

- Intensive: excavation below 18 inches and/or over a large area on any site that is within 800 feet of the historic alignment of Putah Creek, or that is adjacent to a recorded archaeological site. Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1 (i), (ii) and (iii).

LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(b) During the planning phase of the project, the campus shall implement the following steps to identify and protect archaeological resources that may be present in the APE:

- (i) For project sites at all levels of investigation, contractor crews shall be required to attend an informal training session prior to the start of earth moving, regarding how to recognize archaeological sites and artifacts. In addition, campus employees whose work routinely involves disturbing the soil shall be informed how to recognize evidence of potential archaeological sites and artifacts. Prior to disturbing the soil, contractors shall be notified that they are required to watch for potential archaeological sites and artifacts and to notify the campus if any are found. In the event of a find, the campus shall implement item (vi), below.
- (ii) For project sites requiring a moderate or intensive level of investigation, a surface survey shall be conducted by a qualified archaeologist during project planning and design and prior to soil disturbing activities. For sites requiring moderate investigation, in the event of a surface find, intensive investigation will be implemented, as per item (iii), below. Irrespective of findings, the qualified archaeologist shall, in consultation with the campus, develop an archaeological monitoring plan to be implemented during the construction phase of the project. The frequency and duration of monitoring shall be adjusted in accordance with survey results, the nature of construction activities, and results during the monitoring period. In the event of a discovery, the campus shall implement item (vi), below.
- (iii) For project sites requiring intensive investigation, irrespective of subsurface finds, the campus shall retain a qualified archaeologist to conduct a subsurface investigation of the project site, to ascertain whether buried archaeological materials are present and, if so, the extent of the deposit relative to the project's area of potential effects. If an archaeological deposit is discovered, the archaeologist will prepare a site record and file it with the California Historical Resource Information System.
- (iv) If it is determined through step (iii), above, that the resource extends into the project's area of potential effects, the resource will be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist, who will determine whether it qualifies as a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource under the criteria of CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5. If the resource does not qualify, or if no resource is present within the project area of potential effects (APE), this

will be noted in the environmental document and no further mitigation is required unless there is a discovery during construction (see (vi), below).

- (v) If a resource within the project APE is determined to qualify as an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource (as defined by CEQA), the campus shall consult with the qualified archaeologist to consider means of avoiding or reducing ground disturbance within the site boundaries, including minor modifications of building footprint, landscape modification, the placement of protective fill, the establishment of a preservation easement, or other means that will permit avoidance or substantial preservation in place of the resource. If avoidance or substantial preservation in place is not possible, the campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation 4.5-2(a).
- (vi) If a resource is discovered during construction (whether or not an archaeologist is present), all soil disturbing work within 100 feet of the find shall cease. The campus shall contact a qualified archaeologist to provide and implement a plan for survey, subsurface investigation as needed to define the deposit, and assessment of the remainder of the site within the project area to determine whether the resource is significant and would be affected by the project. LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(b), steps (iii) through (vii) shall be implemented.
- (vii) A written report of the results of investigations will be prepared by a qualified archaeologist and filed with the appropriate Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System.

LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(c)

- (i) Before altering or otherwise affecting a building or structure 50 years old or older, the campus shall retain a qualified architectural historian to record it on a California Department of Parks and Recreation DPR 523 form or equivalent documentation. Its significance shall be assessed by a qualified architectural historian, using the significance criteria set forth for historic resources under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The evaluation process shall include the development of appropriate historical background research as context for the assessment of the significance of the structure in the history of the University system, the campus, and the region. For historic buildings, structures or features that do not meet the CEQA criteria for historical resource, no further mitigation is required and the impact is less than significant.
- (ii) For a building or structure that qualifies as a historical resource, the architectural historian and the campus shall consult to consider measures that would enable the project to avoid direct or indirect impacts to the building or structure. These could include preserving a building on the margin of the project site, using it "as is," or other measures that would

not alter the building. If the project cannot avoid modifications to a significant building or structure, the campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation 4.5-2.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.5-1(a), 4.5-1(b), and 4.5-1(c) will reduce the potentially significant impact associated with damage or destruction of an archaeological resource or a historic building or structure to a less-than-significant level.**

- b. *Impact 4.5-2 Impact on the Significance of a Unique Archaeological or Historical Resource.* Implementation of the LRDP could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or unique archaeological resource, as defined in CEQA guidelines 15064.5, as the result of ground disturbance, alteration, removal or demolition associated with project development. This impact is significant.

LRDP Mitigation 4.5-2(a) For an archaeological site that has been determined by a qualified archaeologist to qualify as an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource through the process set forth under LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(b), and where it has been determined under LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(b) that avoidance or preservation in place is not feasible, a qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the campus, shall:

- (i) Prepare a research design and archaeological data recovery plan for the recovery that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant, and implement the data recovery plan prior to or during development of the site.
- (ii) Perform appropriate technical analyses, prepare a full written report and file it with the appropriate information center, and provide for the permanent curation of recovered materials.
- (iii) If, in the opinion of the qualified archaeologist and in light of the data available, the significance of the site is such that data recovery cannot capture the values that qualify the site for inclusion on the CRHR, the campus shall reconsider project plans in light of the high value of the resource, and implement more substantial modifications to the proposed project that would allow the site to be preserved intact, such as project redesign, placement of fill, or project relocation or abandonment. If no such measures are feasible, the campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation 4.5-3.

LRDP Mitigation 4.5-2(b) For a structure or building that has been determined by a qualified architectural historian to qualify as an historical resource through the process set forth under LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(c), and where it has been determined under LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(c) that avoidance is not feasible, documentation and treatment shall be carried out as described below:

- (i) If the building or structure can be preserved on site, but remodeling, renovation or other alterations are required, this work shall be conducted in compliance with the “Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings” (Weeks and Grimmer 1995).
- (ii) If a significant historic building or structure is proposed for major alteration or renovation, or to be moved and/or demolished, the campus shall ensure that a qualified architectural historian thoroughly documents the building and associated landscaping and setting. Documentation shall include still and video photography and a written documentary record of the building to the standards of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) or Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), including accurate scaled mapping, architectural descriptions, and scaled architectural plans, if available. A copy of the record shall be deposited with the University archives, Shields Library Special Collections. The record shall be accompanied by a report containing site-specific history and appropriate contextual information. This information shall be gathered through site specific and comparative archival research, and oral history collection as appropriate.
- (iii) If preservation and reuse at the site are not feasible, the historical building shall be documented as described in item (ii) and, when physically and financially feasible, be moved and preserved or reused.
- (iv) If, in the opinion of the qualified architectural historian, the nature and significance of the building is such that its demolition or destruction cannot be fully mitigated through documentation, the campus shall reconsider project plans in light of the high value of the resource, and implement more substantial modifications to the proposed project that would allow the structure to be preserved intact. These could include project redesign, relocation or abandonment. If no such measures are feasible, the campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation 4.5-3.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.5-2(a) and 4.5-2(b) will reduce the potentially significant impact associated substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or unique archaeological resource to a less-than-significant level, except in cases where the values that contribute to the significance of the resource cannot be preserved through documentation and data recovery, as discussed under Impact 4.5-3, below.**

- c. *Impact 4.5-3 Impact on the Significance of a Unique Archaeological Resource or Historical Resource in Cases Where Significance Cannot Be Preserved through Mitigation.* Implementation of the LRDP could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or

unique archaeological resource, as defined in CEQA Guidelines 15064.5, and the values that contribute to the significance of the resource cannot be preserved through documentation and data recovery. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.5-3 If a significant historic resource or unique archaeological resource cannot be preserved intact, before the property is damaged or destroyed the campus shall ensure that the resource is appropriately documented, as follows.

- (i) For a built environment feature, appropriate documentation is described under LRDP 4.5-2(b)(iii).
- (ii) For an archaeological site, a program of research-directed data recovery shall be conducted and reported, consistent with LRDP Mitigation 4.5-2(a).

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that, for the rare sites that are highly significant, and where data recovery or documentation cannot fully preserve the values represented by the site, implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.5-3 would reduce the significance of the impact on cultural resources. However, if a highly exceptional historical resource cannot be preserved in place, and if the historic values it represents cannot be fully captured through documentation and data recovery, impacts to the resource cannot be fully mitigated. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- d. *Impact 4.5-4 Disturbance of Human Remains.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.5-4(a) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1, 4.5-2 and 4.5-3 to minimize the potential for disturbance or destruction of human remains in an archaeological context and to preserve them in place, if feasible.

LRDP Mitigation 4.5-4(b) Provide a representative of the local Native American community an opportunity to monitor any excavation (including archaeological excavation) within the boundaries of a known Native American archaeological site.

LRDP Mitigation 4.5-4(c) In the event of a discovery on campus of human bone, suspected human bone, or a burial, all excavation in the vicinity will halt immediately and the area of the find will be protected until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the bone is human. If the qualified archaeologist determines the bone is human, or if a qualified archaeologist is not present, the campus will notify the Yolo or Solano County Coroner (depending on the county of the find) of the find before additional disturbance occurs. Consistent with California Health and Safety Code §7050.5(b),

which prohibits disturbance of human remains uncovered by excavation until the Coroner has made a finding relative to PRC 5097 procedures, the campus will ensure the remains and vicinity of the find are protected against further disturbance. If it is determined that the find is of Native American origin, the campus will comply with the provisions of PRC § 5097.98 regarding identification and involvement of the Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD).

LRDP Mitigation 4.5-4(d) If human remains cannot be left in place, the campus shall ensure that the qualified archaeologist and the MLD are provided opportunity to confer on archaeological treatment of human remains, and that appropriate studies, as identified through this consultation, are carried out prior to reinterment. The campus shall provide results of all such studies to the local Native American community, and shall provide an opportunity of local Native American involvement in any interpretative reporting. As stipulated by the provisions of the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, the campus shall ensure that human remains and associated artifacts recovered from campus projects on state lands are repatriated to the appropriate local tribal group if requested.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.5-4(a), 4.5-4(b), 4.5-4(c), and 4.5-4(d) will reduce the potentially significant impact associated with disturbance of human remains to a less-than-significant level.**

- e. *Impact 4.5-5 Impact on Archaeological Resources and Historical Resources--Cumulative.* Development under the 2003 LRDP would contribute to cumulative damage to and loss of the resource base of unique archaeological resources and historical resources. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.5-5 Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.5-1 through 4.5-4.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that UC Davis cultural resources protocols, as stipulated in the LRDP Mitigations 4.5-1 through 4.5-4, will minimize the impact of development under the 2003 LRDP on unique archaeological resources and historical resources. Because there are no measures that can fully mitigate this impact, and because the University of California cannot guarantee implementation by other agencies of measures to protect historical resources and unique archaeological resources, the impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

## 6. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

- a. *Impact 4.6-1 Seismic Ground Shaking and Seismic-Related Ground Failure.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not expose people and structures on campus to potentially adverse effects associated with seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, but would not create risks to life or property. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the impact related to seismic ground shaking and seismic-related ground failure is less-than-significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- b. *Impact 4.6-2 Unstable Geologic Unit or Soil.* Development under the 2003 LRDP could occur on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and could result in on- or offsite lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential that development under the 2003 LRDP could occur on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and could result in on- or offsite lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- c. *Impact 4.6-3 Expansive Soil.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could result in construction of campus facilities on expansive soil, but would not create potential risks to life or property. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not have a significant impact associated with construction on expansive soil; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- d. *Impact 4.6-4 Construction of Septic Tanks.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could result in the construction of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas on campus where soils are not capable of adequately supporting them. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.6-4 Site-specific percolation testing or test borings shall be performed as part of the site analysis process at sites where septic tank disposal systems are proposed to determine if the soils are capable of adequately supporting them. The campus shall follow guidelines for septic system design provided in the Uniform Plumbing Code.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.6-4 will reduce the potentially significant**

**impact associated with construction of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems to a less-than-significant level.**

- e. *Impact 4.6-5 Seismic Ground Shaking--Cumulative.* Cumulative development including the development on campus under the 2003 LRDP, could expose people or structures to potential adverse effects involving seismic ground shaking but the impact would be less than significant.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the cumulative impact associated with seismic ground shaking that would result from development under the 2003 LRDP in conjunction with other development in the region is less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

**7. Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

- a. *Impact 4.7-1 Increased Use of Hazardous Chemicals.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase routine hazardous chemical use on campus by UC Davis laboratories and departments and in maintenance and support operations, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-1 The campus shall continue to implement the same (or equivalent) safety plans, programs, practices, and procedures related to the use, storage, and disposal of hazardous chemical materials during the 2003 LRDP planning horizon, including, but not necessarily limited to, the Business Plan, Hazardous Materials Communication Program, Chemical Inventory System, CUPA Self-Audit program, Injury and Illness Prevention Program, Chemical Hygiene Plans, Medical Surveillance Program, Chemical Safety Advisory Committee, Chemical Carcinogen Safety Program, and EH&S audits and safety training. These programs may be replaced by other programs that incorporate similar health and safety measures.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the hazard from the increased use of hazardous chemicals by campus laboratories and departments and by maintenance and support operations resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.7-1 will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- b. *Impact 4.7-2 Increased Generation of Hazardous Wastes.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase the routine generation of hazardous wastes on campus by UC Davis laboratories and departments and by maintenance and support operations, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-2(a) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.7-1.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-2(b) The campus shall continue to implement the same (or equivalent) hazardous waste management programs during the 2003 LRDP planning horizon, including, but not necessarily limited to, hazardous waste storage and handling procedures, the waste minimization program, the pretreatment program, and the Waste Exclusion Program. These programs may be subject to modification as more stringent standards are developed or if the programs become obsolete through replacement by other programs that incorporate similar health and safety protection measures.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the hazard from the increased generation of hazardous wastes by campus laboratories and departments and from maintenance and support operations resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.7-2(a) and 4.7-2(b) will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- c. *Impact 4.7-3 Increased Use of Radioactive Materials.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase the routine use of radioactive materials on campus by UC Davis laboratories, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-3(a) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.7-1.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-3(b) The campus shall continue to implement the same (or equivalent) Health Physics Program during the 2003 LRDP planning horizon. This program may be subject to modification as more stringent standards are developed or if the program becomes obsolete through replacement by other programs that incorporate similar health and safety protection measures.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the hazard from the increased use of radioactive materials by campus laboratories resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.7-3(a) and 4.7-3(b) will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- d. *Impact 4.7-4 Increased Generation of Radioactive Wastes.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase the routine generation of radioactive waste on campus by UC Davis laboratories, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-4(a) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.7-1.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-4(b) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.7-3(b).

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-4(c) The campus shall continue to implement measures to reduce the generation of radioactive waste, including the requirement that employees working with radioactive materials be trained in radioactive waste minimization, EH&S on-line information about radioactive waste minimization, and exploration of waste minimization techniques by EH&S staff.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the hazard from the increased generation of radioactive waste by campus laboratories resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.7-4(a), 4.7-4(b), and 4.7-4(c) will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- e. Impact 4.7-5 Increased Use of Biohazardous Materials.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase the routine use of biohazardous materials on campus by UC Davis laboratories, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-5(a) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.7-1.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-5(b) The campus shall continue to implement the same (or equivalent) Biosafety Program during the 2003 LRDP planning horizon. This program may be subject to modification as more stringent standards are developed or if the program becomes obsolete through replacement by other programs that incorporate similar health and safety protection measures.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the hazard from the increased use of biohazardous materials by campus laboratories resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.7-5(a) and 4.7-5(b) will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- f. Impact 4.7-6 Increased Generation of Biohazardous Wastes.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase the routine generation of radioactive waste on campus by UC Davis laboratories, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-6(a) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.7-1.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-6(b) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.7-5(b).

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the hazard from the increased generation of biohazardous waste by campus laboratories resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP is a less-than-**

**significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.7-6(a) and 4.7-6(b) will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- g. *Impact 4.7-7 Increased Use of Laboratory Animals.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase the routine use of laboratory animals on campus by UC Davis laboratories, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-7(a) Mitigation 4.7-1.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-7(b) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.7-5(b).

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-7(c) The campus shall continue to implement the same (or equivalent) programs related to laboratory animal use during the 2003 LRDP planning horizon, including, but not necessarily limited to, inspections of animal facilities and study areas by the Campus Veterinarian, requiring investigators to prepare Animal Use and Care Protocols, review of Animal Use and Care Protocols by the AUCAAC and EH&S, employee training in animal handling, and the campus animal health program. These programs may be subject to modification as more stringent standards are developed or if the programs become obsolete through replacement by other programs that incorporate similar health and safety protection measures.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the hazard from the increased use of laboratory animals by campus laboratories resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.7-7(a), 4.7-7(b), and 4.7-7(c) will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- h. *Impact 4.7-8 Routine Transport of Hazardous Materials.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase the routine transport of hazardous materials to and from campus, which would not increase hazards to the public or the environment. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-8 The campus shall continue to require that packaging of chemicals to be transported on public roads conform with all legal requirements.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the increase in routine transport of hazardous materials to and from the campus is a less-than-significant impact. LRDP Mitigation 4.7-8 will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- i. *Impact 4.7-9 Hazardous Materials Release under Upset Conditions.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and

accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-9 Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.7-1 through 4.7-8.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the hazard from a release of hazardous materials into the environment under reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions as a result of development under the 2003 LRDP is a less-than-significant impact. LRDP Mitigation 4.7-9 will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- j. *Impact 4.7-10 Hazardous Materials Use by Non-UC Entities on Campus.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could increase use of hazardous materials by non-UC entities on campus, which could create hazards to the public or the environment under routine and upset conditions. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.1-10 For projects proposed by non-UC entities on campus that involve laboratory space, non-UC entities shall be required, through contracts and agreements, to implement programs and controls that provide the same level of protection required of campus laboratories and departments.

The following project-specific mitigation measures would be implemented for non-UCD tenants:

- (i) Non-UC entities shall submit the qualifications of designated laboratory directors to UC Davis EH&S Office prior to commencing laboratory operations. Such documentation shall be in the form of educational and professional qualifications/experience.
- (ii) Non-UC entities shall submit certification of compliance with NIH biosafety principles to the UC Davis EH&S Office prior to commencing on-site research or pilot plant manufacturing activities. Non-UC entities shall submit copies of completed medical waste management plans, biosafety management plans, inventories of infectious or genetically modified agents, applicable permits and updates.
- (iii) If hazardous material quantities are proposed to be increased above applicable threshold quantities as defined in California Code of Regulations, Title 19, Division 2, Chapter 4.5, non-UC entities shall implement a Risk Management Plan/California Accidental Release Prevention Plan (RMP/Cal-ARP), which discusses the handling and storage of acutely hazardous materials on site. The RMP/Cal-ARP shall be approved by the CUPA and filed with the UC Davis EH&S Office prior to commencing proposed operations.

- (iv) Non-UC entities shall submit certification to the UC Davis EH&S to verify that applicable requirements for handling and disposal of hazardous wastes have been met prior to commencing on-site research or pilot plant manufacturing activities. Non-UC entities shall submit copies of management plans for handling and disposal of hazardous wastes, and written verification of contracts with licensed waste disposal firms.
- (v) Non-UC entities shall provide to campus EH&S copies of all required environmental reports to local, state, and federal environmental and safety regulators.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4-7-10 (i) through (v) will reduce the potentially significant impact associated with hazardous materials use by non-UC entities on campus to a less-than-significant level.**

- k. Impact 4.7-11 Hazards to Those Attending Schools.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP EIR would result in handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school, which would not create a significant hazard to those attending the schools. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for implementation of the 2003 LRDP to result in hazards associated with handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials within ¼ mile of a school is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- l. Impact 4.7-12 Exposure to Contaminated Soil or Groundwater.* Construction activities on campus under the 2003 LRDP would not expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated soil or groundwater. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-12 The campus shall perform due diligence assessments of all sites where ground-disturbing construction is proposed.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for construction activities under the 2003 LRDP to expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated soil or groundwater is a less-than-significant impact. LRDP Mitigation 4.7-12 will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- m. Impact 4.7-13 Exposure to Contaminated Building Materials.* Construction activities on campus under the 2003 LRDP would not expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated building materials. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-13 The campus shall survey buildings for potential contamination before any demolition or renovation work is performed.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for construction activities under the 2003 LRDP to expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated building materials is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.7-13 will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- n. *Impact 4.7-14 Construction on or near the LEHR Site.* Development under the 2003 LRDP could include construction on or near the campus' LEHR site, included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, which would not pose a hazard to the public or the environment. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential that implementation of the 2003 LRDP would result in hazards to the public or the environment as a result of construction on or near the campus' LEHR site is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- o. *Impact 4.7-15 Hazards Associated with University Airport.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would include campus development within 2 miles of public use airports, which could result in safety hazards for people residing or working in the area and hazards to aircraft as a result to glare from campus lighting. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-15(a) The UC Davis Airport flight pattern for Runway 16 shall be changed to a right-hand approach.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-15(b) Lighting for recreation fields in the NMP will be tested by night flights, and adjusted as necessary to eliminate glare that could pose a hazard for aircraft.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-15(c) UC Davis or a developer acting on behalf of UC Davis shall include disclosure statements in marketing and sales materials for the NMP informing potential owners of property in the NMP of the presence of the University Airport.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.7-15 (a), 4.7-15(b), and 4.7-15(c) will reduce the potentially significant impact associated with the University Airport to a less-than-significant level.**

- p. *Impact 4.7-16 Exceedance of Emergency Response Capabilities.* Hazardous materials use on campus under the 2003 LRDP would not

exceed emergency response capabilities. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for hazardous materials use on campus under the 2003 LRDP to exceed emergency response capabilities is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- q. Impact 4.7-17 Interference with Emergency Operations Plan.* Campus development under the 2003 LRDP could physically interfere with the campus' Emergency Operations Plan. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-17 To the extent feasible, the campus shall maintain at least one unobstructed lane in both directions on campus roadways. At any time only a single lane is available due to construction-related road closures, the campus shall provide a temporary traffic signal, signal carriers (i.e., flagpersons), or other appropriate traffic controls to allow travel in both directions. If construction activities require the complete closure of a roadway, the campus shall provide appropriate signage indicating alternative routes. To ensure adequate access for emergency vehicles when construction projects would result in temporary lane or roadway closures, the campus shall inform emergency services, including the UC Davis Police and Fire Departments, and American Medical Response, of the closures and alternative travel routes.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.7-17 will reduce the potentially significant impact associated with interference with the campus' Emergency Response Plan to a less-than-significant level.**

- r. Impact 4.7-18 Increased Hazardous Materials Use--Cumulative.* Campus development under the 2003 LRDP in combination with growth in the region would not significantly increase hazards to the public or the environment associated with the use and transport of hazardous materials and the generation of hazardous waste. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the increased use and transport of hazardous materials and increased generation of hazardous waste resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP in conjunction with other development in the region is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

## **8. Hydrology and Water Quality**

- a. Impact 4.8-1 Impact of Construction Activities on Water Quality.* Campus construction activities associated with implementation of the

2003 LRDP would not contribute substantial loads of sediment or other pollutants in storm water runoff that could degrade receiving water quality. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-1 The campus shall continue to comply with the NPDES state-wide General Permit for Discharge of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity by implementing control measures and BMPs required by project-specific SWPPPs and with the Phase II SWMP to eliminate or reduce non-storm and storm water discharges to receiving waters.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the impact of campus construction activities on receiving water quality is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.8-1 will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- b. *Impact 4.8-2 Impact of Increased Runoff and Pollutant Loads on Water Quality.* Development under the 2003 LRDP would increase impervious surface on the campus and could alter drainage patterns, thereby increasing runoff and loads of pollutants in storm water, which could affect water quality. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-2 The campus shall comply with the measures in the Phase II SWMP to ensure that project design includes a combination of BMPs, or equally effective measures as they become available in the future, to minimize the contribution of pollutants to receiving waters.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.8-2 will reduce the potentially significant impact associated with increased runoff and loads of pollutants in storm water to a less-than-significant level.**

- c. *Impact 4.8-3 Impact of Increased Runoff on Potential for Flooding.* The Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could alter drainage patterns in the project area and increase impervious surfaces, which could exceed the capacity of storm water drainage systems and result in localized flooding and contribution to offsite flooding. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-3(a) Prior to approval of specific projects under the 2003 LRDP, the campus shall perform a drainage study to evaluate each specific development to determine whether project runoff would exceed the capacity of the existing storm drainage system, cause ponding to worsen, and/or increase the potential for property damage from flooding.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-3(b) If it is determined that existing drainage capacity would be exceeded, ponding could worsen, and/or risk of property damage from flooding could

increase, the campus shall design and implement necessary and feasible improvements. Such improvements could include, but would not be limited to, the following:

- (i) The expansion or modification of the existing storm drainage system.
- (ii) Single-project detention or retention basins incorporated into project design with features including but not limited to: small onsite detention or retention basins; rooftop ponding; temporary flooding of parking areas, streets and gutters; landscaping designed to temporarily retain water; and gravel beds designed to collect and retain runoff.
- (iii) Multi-project storm water detention or retention basins.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-3(c) Campus development west of County Road 98 shall incorporate single- or multi-project basins in order to reduce storm event drainage flows to the Covell Drain.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.8-3(a), 4.8-3(b), and 4.8-3(c) will reduce the potentially significant impact of increased potential for flooding as a result of the alteration of drainage patterns and increase in impervious surfaces to a less-than-significant level.**

- d. *Impact 4.8-4 Increased Discharge of Treated Wastewater Effluent.* Campus growth under the 2003 LRDP would increase discharge of treated effluent from the campus wastewater treatment plant into the South Fork of Putah Creek, which could exceed waste discharge requirements and degrade receiving water quality.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-4(a) The campus shall continue to monitor and modify its pretreatment program, WWTP operation, and/or treatment processes as necessary to comply with WDRs.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-4(b) The campus shall implement a monitoring program specifically targeted at the following constituents: copper, cyanide, iron and nitrate + nitrite, and make appropriate modifications as necessary to the campus pretreatment program to avoid exceedance of permit limits for these constituents.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.8-4(a) and 4.8-4(b) will reduce the potentially significant impact associated with the increased discharge of treated wastewater effluent to a less-than-significant level.**

- e. *Impact 4.8-5 Impact on Deep Aquifer.* Campus growth under the 2003 LRDP could in result in a net deficit in the deep aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-5(a) The campus shall continue to implement water conservation strategies to reduce demand for water from the deep aquifer. Domestic water conservation strategies shall include the following or equivalent measures:

- (i) Install water efficient shower heads and low-flow toilets that meet or exceed building code conservation requirements in all new campus buildings, and where feasible, retrofit existing buildings with these water efficient devices.
- (ii) Continue the leak detection and repair program.
- (iii) Continue converting existing single-pass cooling systems to cooling tower systems.
- (iv) Use water-conservative landscaping on the west and south campuses where domestic water is used for irrigation.
- (v) Replace domestic water irrigation systems on the west and south campuses with an alternate water source (shallow/intermediate or reclaimed water), where feasible.
- (vi) Install water meters at the proposed neighborhood to encourage residential water conservation.
- (vii) Identify and implement additional feasible water conservation strategies and programs including a water awareness program focused on water conservation.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-5(b) The campus shall continue hydrogeologic monitoring and evaluation efforts to determine the long-term production and quality trends of the deep aquifer.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-5(c) To the extent feasible, new water supply wells in the deep aquifer should be located on the west campus in sands and gravels that are not used by or available to the City of Davis for deep water extraction.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-5(d) If continued hydrogeologic monitoring and evaluation efforts identify constraints in the deep aquifer's ability to provide for the campus' long-term water needs, the campus will treat shallow/intermediate aquifer and/or surface water from the Solano Project to serve domestic water demand.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.8-5(a), 4.8-5(b), 4.8-5(c), and 4.8-5(d) will reduce the overall effect of the project on the deep aquifer. However, regardless of these mitigation measures, if UC Davis demand for water from the deep aquifer increases, groundwater levels in the deep aquifer could lower, contributing to a net deficit in the overall ground water budget. For this reason, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other**

**unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- f. Impact 4.8-6 Impact Associated with Shallow/Intermediate Aquifer.*  
Campus growth under the 2003 LRDP could deplete groundwater levels in the shallow/intermediate aquifers, contribute to local subsidence, and interfere substantially with recharge. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-6(a) The campus shall continue to implement water conservation strategies to reduce demand for water from the intermediate aquifer. Utility water conservation strategies shall include the following or equivalent measures:

- (i) Landscape, where appropriate, with native, drought resistant plants and use lawns only where needed for pedestrian traffic, activity areas, and recreation.
- (ii) Install efficient irrigation systems including centrally-controlled automatic irrigation systems and low-flow spray systems.
- (iii) Apply heavy applications of mulch to landscaped areas to reduce evaporation.
- (iv) Use treated wastewater for landscape irrigation where feasible.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-6(b) The campus shall continue to monitor shallow/intermediate aquifer water elevations at existing campus wells to ascertain whether there is any long-term decline in water levels.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-6(c) The campus shall continue to participate in regional subsidence monitoring, including by installing an extensimeter, to determine the vertical location of local subsidence.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-6(d) If shallow/intermediate aquifer monitoring or subsidence monitoring indicates that campus water use from the intermediate aquifer is contributing to a net deficit in aquifer volume and/or significant subsidence, the campus will reduce use of water from the aquifer by using surface water and/or treated wastewater effluent to irrigate campus recreation fields.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-6(e) The campus shall incorporate the following or equally effective measures into project designs under the 2003 LRDP where feasible, to increase percolation and infiltration of precipitation into the underlying shallow/intermediate aquifers:

- (i) Minimize paved surfaces.
- (ii) Use grassy swales, infiltration trenches, or grass filter strips to intercept storm water runoff.
- (iii) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.8-2(b), which specifies construction of detention and infiltration facilities in those areas that do not discharge storm water to the Arboretum.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.8-6(a), 4.8-6(b), 4.8-6(c), 4.8-6(d), and 4.8-6(e) will reduce the overall impact associated with the shallow/intermediate aquifer resulting from the project; however, regardless of mitigation, the combination of effects from continued demand for water from the shallow/intermediate aquifer and increased coverage could result in a significant impact on intermediate aquifer groundwater levels and result in continued or increased subsidence. For this reason, the impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- g. Impact 4.8-7 Quality of Domestic Water Supply.* The quality of the domestic water supply may experience degradation in the future, which would impact the campus' ability to meet federal and state drinking water standards. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the possibility that the quality of the domestic water supply may experience degradation is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- h. Impact 4.8-8 Use of Reclaimed Water.* The potential use of reclaimed water treated at the campus WWTP under the 2003 LRDP would not cause adverse impacts to water quality or human health. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential use of reclaimed water under the 2003 LRDP is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- i. Impact 4.8-9 Construction in the 100-Year Floodplain.* Development under the 2003 LRDP could place non-residential structures within a 100-year floodplain, which could expose people and structures to risks associated with flooding and/or impede a redirect flows, contributing to flood hazards. This is a potentially significant impact.

**LRDP Mitigation 4.8-9(a)** Prior to final design, the campus will review the plans for all structures to be constructed in the 100-year floodplain for compliance with the following FEMA requirements for non-residential structures:

- (i) Elevate the lowest floor (including the basement) to or above the base flood level; or
- (ii) Together with attendant utility and sanitary facilities, design so that below the base flood level, the structure is watertight with walls substantially impermeable to the passage of water and with structural components having the capability of resisting hydrostatic and hydrodynamic loads and effects of buoyancy; and

- (iii) Require that fully enclosed areas below the lowest floor that are subject to flooding be designed to automatically equalize hydrostatic flood forces on exterior walls by allowing for entry and exit of flood waters.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-9(b) For structures placed within the 100-year floodplain, flood control devices will be designed to direct flows toward areas where flood hazards will be minimal.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.8-9(a) and 4.8-9(b) will reduce the potentially significant impact associated with construction in the 100-year floodplain to a less-than-significant level.**

- j. Impact 4.8-10 Impact of Storm Water Runoff on Water Quality-- Cumulative.* Development under the 2003 LRDP, in conjunction with construction activities, increased impervious surfaces, and alterations to drainage patterns associated with other development in the region, could increase storm water runoff and could provide substantial sources of polluted runoff, which could affect receiving water quality. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-10(a) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.8-1 and 4.8-2.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-10(b) Jurisdictions within the Putah Creek watershed should comply with Phase II NPDES Municipal Storm Water Permit requirements for small municipalities in order to minimize the contribution of sediment and other pollutants associated with development in the region.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-10(c) Comprehensive SWPPPs and monitoring programs should be implemented by all storm water dischargers associated with specified industrial and construction activities, in compliance with the state's General Permits. Such plans shall include BMPs or equally effective measures.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.8-10(a), 4.8-10(b), and 4.8-10(c) will reduce the overall effect of increased storm water runoff and polluted runoff resulting from implementation of the project in conjunction with other development in the region on receiving water quality. However, because these mitigation measures depend on other jurisdictions, University of California cannot guarantee their implementation. For this reason, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- k. *Impact 4.8-12 Impact of Increased Discharge of Treated Wastewater--Cumulative.* Growth under the 2003 LRDP and other development in the region would increase discharge of treated effluent to the Putah Creek watershed, which could degrade receiving water quality. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-12 The campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation 4.8-4(a) and (b) to minimize the potential for degradation of receiving water quality.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.8-12 will reduce the potentially significant cumulative impact of increased discharge of treated wastewater effluent to the Putah Creek watershed to a less-than-significant level.**

- l. *Impact 4.8-13 Impact on Deep Aquifer--Cumulative.* Growth under the 2003 LRDP and other development in the region could result in a net deficit in the deep aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-13(a) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.8-5(a-d).

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-13(b) The City of Davis is expected to implement measures to reduce the amount of water withdrawn from the deep aquifer consistent with policies adopted in its General Plan.

- Give priority to demand reduction and conservation over additional water resource development (Policy WATER 1.1)
- Require water conserving landscaping (Policy WATER 1.2)
- Provide for the current and long-range water needs of the Davis Planning Area, and for protection of the quality and quantity of groundwater resources (Policy WATER 2.1)
- Manage groundwater resources so as to preserve both quantity and quality (Policy WATER 2.2)
- Research, monitor and participate in issues in Yolo County and the area of origin of the City's groundwater that affect the quality and quantity of water (Policy WATER 4.1).

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.8-13(a) and 4.8-13(b) will reduce the overall impact of the project in conjunction with other development in the region on the deep aquifer; however, the reliability of the deep aquifer could be at risk if both UC Davis and the City of Davis rely on it to meet their future needs without developing a new source of supply. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the**

**benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- m. Impact 4.8-14 Increased Withdrawal from Shallow/Intermediate Aquifers--Cumulative.* Growth under the 2003 LRDP and other development in the region could contribute to local subsidence and result in a net deficit in the shallow/intermediate aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-14(a) The campus should implement LRDP Mitigation 4.8-6(a-e) to minimize its withdrawal from the shallow/intermediate aquifer and maximize the potential for infiltration.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-14(b) Consistent with current water planning policies, the City of Davis is expected to implement measures to reduce impervious surfaces and reduce the amount of water withdrawn from the shallow/intermediate aquifer, consistent with, but not limited to, the water policies listed in LRDP Mitigation 4.8-13(b).

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.8-14(a) and 4.8-14(b) will reduce the overall impact associated with increased withdrawal from the shallow/intermediate aquifers resulting from the project in conjunction with other development in the region; however, regardless of mitigation, the combination of effects from continued local demand for water from the shallow/intermediate aquifers and increased coverage could result in lowering of the groundwater table and continued subsidence. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

## **9. Land Use and Planning**

- a. Impact 4.9-1 Conflicts with Land Use Plans.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project that was adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for the 2003 LRDP to conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- b. Impact 4.9-2 Compatibility with Adjacent Land Uses.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not result in the development of land uses that are substantially incompatible with existing adjacent land uses or planned uses. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for the 2003 LRDP to result in the development of land uses that are incompatible with adjacent land uses is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- c. *Impact 4.9-3 Conflict with Habitat Conservation Plan.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not conflict with a habitat conservation plan or a natural community conservation plan. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for implementation of the 2003 LRDP to conflict with a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- d. *Impact 4.9-4 Conflict with Land Use Plans--Cumulative.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP, together with other regional growth, would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project that was adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for implementation of the 2003 LRDP, in conjunction with other development in the region, to conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

## 10. Noise

- a. *Impact 4.10-1 Noise from Construction Activities.* Construction of campus facilities pursuant to the 2003 LRDP could expose nearby receptors to excessive groundborne vibration and airborne or groundborne noise. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.10-1 Prior to initiation of construction, the campus shall approve a construction noise mitigation program including but not limited to the following:

- Construction equipment shall be properly outfitted and maintained with feasible noise-reduction devices to minimize construction-generated noise.
- Stationary noise sources such as generators or pumps shall be located 100 feet away from noise-sensitive land uses as feasible.
- Laydown and construction vehicle staging areas shall be located 100 feet away from noise-sensitive land uses as feasible.

- Whenever possible, academic, administrative, and residential areas that will be subject to construction noise shall be informed a week before the start of each construction project.
- Loud construction activity (i.e., construction activity such as jackhammering, concrete sawing, asphalt removal, and large-scale grading operations) within 100 feet of a residential or academic building shall not be scheduled during finals week.
- Loud construction activity as described above within 100 feet of an academic or residential use shall, to the extent feasible, be scheduled during holidays, Thanksgiving breaks, Christmas break, Spring break, or Summer break.
- Loud construction activity within 100 feet of a residential or academic building shall be restricted to occur between 7:30 AM and 7:30 PM.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.10-1 will reduce the potentially significant impact of construction-related noise to a less-than-significant level.**

- b. *Impact 4.10-2 Noise Associated with Vehicular Traffic.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would result in increased vehicular traffic on the regional road network, which would substantially increase ambient noise levels. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.10-2(a) For noise-sensitive uses adjacent to Russell Boulevard between Arlington Boulevard and Arthur Street, the existing soundwall (approximately 6.5 feet in height) could be increased slightly in height and extended to include the daycare center to the east.

For noise-sensitive uses adjacent to Russell Boulevard between Arthur Street and SR 113, and from SR 113 to La Rue/Anderson Road and from La Rue Road to Oak Street, soundwalls may be constructed for exterior residential and recreational land uses within approximately 100 feet of the centerline of Russell Boulevard, where construction of such walls would not interfere with driveway access.

The campus shall reimburse the City of Davis the campus' fair share of the cost of a City of Davis noise abatement program for reducing interior noise levels in homes along Russell Boulevard that are significantly affected by noise from 2003 LRDP-related growth. The campus' contribution to the City's noise abatement program could be used to extend soundwalls as described above or for other noise abatement measures such as retrofit of homes. The campus' fair share shall be determined based on the volume of traffic added to Russell Boulevard by the campus as a result of 2003 LRDP implementation and the percentage that 2003 LRDP-related traffic increases constitute of the average daily traffic on the roadway.

LRDP Mitigation 4.10-2(b) For components of the 2003 LRDP having future noise-sensitive land uses such as the Neighborhood and Research Park, building and area layouts shall incorporate noise control as a design feature; including increased setbacks, landscaped berms, and using building placement to shield noise-sensitive exterior areas from direct roadway views.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.10-2(a) and 4.10-2(b) will reduce the potentially significant impact of project-related vehicular traffic on ambient noise levels to a less-than-significant level.**

- c. Impact 4.10-3 Noise Associated with University Airport.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not expose residents to elevated noise levels from aircraft operations at the University Airport. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for implementation of the 2003 LRDP to expose residents to elevated noise levels from aircraft operations is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- d. Impact 4.10-4 Exposure to Rail Noise.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could potentially expose noise-sensitive land uses to significant rail noise. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.10-4 Residential and academic uses within 750 feet of the centerline of a rail line shall be evaluated using the Federal Transit Administration Noise and Vibration Guidelines. Following the evaluation, as appropriate, facilities shall be designed and constructed to achieve an interior noise and vibration level within the standards recommended by the guidelines.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.10-4 will reduce the potentially significant impact associated with rail noise to a less-than-significant level.**

- e. Impact 4.10-5 Increased Noise Levels--Cumulative* The 2003 LRDP in combination with other regional development would increase ambient noise levels. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.10-5 Implement LRDP Mitigations 4-10-1 and 4.10-2.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.10-5 will reduce the overall effect of the project on ambient noise levels; however, the impact would not be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the**

**benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

## **11. Population and Housing**

- a. *Impact 4.11-1 Population Growth Inducement.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would directly induce substantial population growth in the area by proposing increased enrollment and additional employment. This is a significant impact.

**FINDING: Although a substantial population increase is itself not a significant environmental effect, the environmental effects associated with land development, increased traffic, and expanded infrastructure and services could be significant. The potential regional and local environmental effects of the expected growth are identified in the appropriate sections of the Final EIR. In certain circumstances, these effects remain significant after mitigation. Accordingly, the effect of increased populations from the proposed project is also considered to be significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- b. *Impact 4.11-2 Indirect Inducement of Population Growth.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not indirectly induce substantial population growth in the area. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for implementation of the 2003 LRDP to induce population growth indirectly is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- c. *Impact 4.11-3 Impact on Regional Housing Demand.* Implementation of the proposed 2003 LRDP and other regional development would not create a demand for housing that could not be accommodated by local jurisdictions. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the impact of the 2003 LRDP on regional housing demand is less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

## **12. Public Services**

- a. *Impact 4.12-1 Impact of Provision of Police Services.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not result in significant environmental impacts associated with the provision of new or altered police facilities. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the impact of the 2003 LRDP associated with the provision of police services is less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- b. *Impact 4.12-2 Impact Associated with Provision of Fire Services by UC Davis Fire Department or the West Plainfield Volunteer Fire Department.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not result in significant environmental impacts associated with the provision of new or altered facilities for the UC Davis Fire Department or the West Plainfield Volunteer Fire Department. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the impact of the 2003 LRDP associated with the provision of fire services by the UC Davis Fire Department or the West Plainfield Volunteer Fire Department is less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- c. *Impact 4.12-3 Impact Associated with Provision of Fire Services by the City of Davis Fire Department.* If the City of Davis Fire Department provides services to the proposed Neighborhood, implementation of the 2003 LRDP could result in significant environmental impacts to agricultural prime farmland and habitat associated with the provision of new or altered facilities. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.12-3 If documented unmitigated significant environmental impacts are caused by construction of facilities for the City of Davis Fire Department that are needed in part to provide service to the proposed University Neighborhood, UC Davis shall negotiate with the City of Davis to determine the campus' fair share (as described in Section 4.12.2.3 [of the Final EIR]) of the costs to implement any feasible and required environmental mitigation measures so long as the unmitigated significant adverse impacts have not been otherwise reduced to less-than-significant levels through regulatory requirements, public funding, or agreements. This mitigation measure shall not apply to any other costs associated with implementation of public service facilities.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.12-3 will reduce the overall effect of the impact associated with the provision of fire services by the City of Davis. However, impacts associated with an irreversible loss of prime farmland and habitat could not be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- d. *Impact 4.12-4 Impact Associated with Increased Demand for School Facilities.* Although implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase the number of school-age children residing in housing on campus, school

facilities constructed in the Neighborhood component of the 2003 LRDP would offset the demand for new educational facilities associated with these children, and the construction of these facilities would not result in significant environmental impacts. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the increased demand for school services resulting from the 2003 LRDP is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- e. Impact 4.12-5 Impact Associated with Increased Demand for Library Facilities.* Campus population growth under the 2003 LRDP would increase the demand for library facilities, the construction of which would not result in significant environmental impacts. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the increased demand for library services resulting from the 2003 LRDP is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- f. Impact 4.12-6 Impact Associated with Provision of Police and Fire Services--Cumulative.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP, in conjunction with regional growth, could generate a cumulative demand for new or expanded police and fire service facilities in the region, the construction of which could result in significant adverse environmental impacts to prime farmland and habitat. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.12-6 If documented unmitigated significant environmental impacts are caused by the construction of police or fire facilities in the Cities of Davis, Dixon, Woodland, and/or Winters that are needed in part due to implementation of the 2003 LRDP, UC Davis shall negotiate with the appropriate local jurisdiction to determine the campus' fair share (as described in Section 4.12.2.3 [of the Final EIR]) of the costs to implement any feasible and required environmental mitigation measures so long as the unmitigated impacts have not been otherwise reduced to less-than-significant levels through regulatory requirements, public funding, or agreements. This mitigation measure shall not apply to any other costs associated with implementation of public service facilities.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.12-6 will reduce the contribution of the project to the cumulative impact associated with the provision of police and fire services. Since in many cases, specific sites for the needed improvements have not been identified, environmental effects associated with facility alteration or development are not known. These development projects would be subject to environmental review and mitigation under CEQA, and most associated environmental impacts could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. However, impacts associated with an irreversible loss of prime farmland and habitat could not**

**be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- g. Impact 4.12-7 Impact of Construction of School Facilities--Cumulative.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP, in conjunction with regional growth, could generate a cumulative demand for new school facilities, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts to agricultural prime farmland and habitat. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.12-7 If documented unmitigated significant environmental impacts are caused by the construction of school facilities in the Cities of Davis, Dixon, Woodland, and/or Winters that are needed in part due to implementation of the 2003 LRDP, UC Davis shall negotiate with the appropriate local jurisdiction to determine the campus' fair share (as described in Section 4.12.2.3 [of the Final EIR]) of the costs to implement any feasible and required environmental mitigation measures so long as the unmitigated impacts have not been otherwise reduced to less-than-significant levels through regulatory requirements, public funding, or agreements. This mitigation measure shall not apply to any other costs associated with implementation of public service facilities.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.12-7 will reduce the contribution of the project to the cumulative impact associated with the construction of school facilities. The new schools would be subject to CEQA review, and most associated environmental impacts could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. However, impacts associated with an irreversible loss of prime farmland and habitat could not be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- h. Impact 4.12-8 Impact Associated with Increased Demand for Library Services--Cumulative.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP and other regional development would increase the population of the area, which could generate a cumulative demand for new libraries, the construction of which would not result in significant environmental impacts. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the cumulative impact of the increased demand for library services associated with the project in conjunction with other development in the region is less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

### 13. Recreation

- a. *Impact 4.13-1 Increased Use of Campus Recreation Facilities.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would result in increased use of campus recreational facilities but would not result in deterioration of facilities. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the impact of the project relative to increased use of campus recreational facilities is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- b. *Impact 4.13-2 Increased Use of Off-Campus Recreation Facilities--Cumulative.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP, together with other regional development, could increase the use of off-campus recreational facilities, the development of which could result in significant environmental impacts. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.13-2 If documented unmitigated significant environmental impacts are caused by the construction of recreation facilities in the Cities of Dixon, Woodland, and/or Winters that are needed in part due to implementation of the 2003 LRDP, UC Davis shall negotiate with the appropriate local jurisdiction to determine the campus' fair share (as described in Section 4.12.2.3 [of the Final EIR]) of the costs to implement any feasible and required environmental mitigation measures so long as the unmitigated impacts have not been otherwise reduced to less-than-significant levels through regulatory requirements, public funding, or agreements. This mitigation measure shall not apply to any other costs associated with implementation of recreation facilities.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.13-2 will reduce the contribution of the project to the cumulative impact associated with the construction of recreational facilities. However, because specific park and recreation sites either have not been identified, or have not been environmentally assessed, the Final EIR could not determine that the impacts would be less than significant. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

### 14. Traffic, Circulation, and Parking

- a. *Impact 4.14-1 Campus Intersection Operations.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would cause unacceptable operations at on-campus intersections. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.14-1(a) UC Davis shall continue to actively pursue Transportation Demand Management strategies to reduce vehicle-trips to and from campus.

LRDP Mitigation 4.14-1(b) UC Davis shall continue to monitor AM and PM peak hour traffic operations at critical intersections and roadways on campus.

LRDP Mitigation 4.14-1(c) UC Davis shall review individual projects proposed under the 2003 LRDP as they advance through the environmental clearance phase of development to determine if intersection or roadway improvements are needed with the additional traffic generated by the proposed project. If intersection operations are found to degrade to unacceptable levels, UC Davis shall construct physical improvements such as adding traffic signals or roundabouts at affected study intersections, as described below.

- *Orchard Road/La Rue Road intersection.* Widen the Orchard Road approaches to include an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane on the eastbound approach, and an exclusive left-turn, a through lane, and a separate right-turn lane on the westbound approach.
- *Hutchison Drive/SR 113 SB Ramp intersection.* Install a traffic signal.
- *Hutchison Drive/SR 113 NB Ramp intersection.* Install a traffic signal.
- *Hutchison Drive/Extension Center Drive intersection.* Modify the southbound Extension Center Drive approach to eliminate left-turns from Extension Center Drive to Hutchison Drive and improve Orchard Park Drive to provide a continuous roadway between Extension Center Drive and Orchard Road
- *Hutchison Drive/La Rue Road intersection.* Widen the southbound La Rue Road approach to include an exclusive right-turn lane.
- *Old Davis Road/A Street intersection.* Construct a roundabout or install a traffic signal or realign Old Davis Road as proposed in the 2003 LRDP.
- *New Davis Road/Beau Vine Lane intersection.* Construct a roundabout or install a traffic signal.
- *New Davis Road/California Avenue intersection.* Install a traffic signal or construct the new roadway proposed in the 2003 LRDP between Old Davis Road and La Rue Road.
- *WB I-80 Ramps/Old Davis Road intersection.* Install a traffic signal.
- *EB I-80 Ramps/Old Davis Road intersection.* Install a traffic signal.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.14-1(a), 4.14-1 (b), and 4.14-1 (c) will reduce the potentially significant impact on campus intersection operations to a less-than-significant level.**

- b. Impact 4.14-2 Off-Campus Intersection and Freeway Operations.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would cause unacceptable intersection and freeway operations at off-campus facilities. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.14-2(a) UC Davis shall continue to actively pursue Transportation Demand Management strategies to reduce vehicle-trips to and from campus.

LRDP Mitigation 4.14-2(b) UC Davis shall continue to monitor AM and PM peak hour traffic operations at critical intersections and roadways in the campus vicinity at least every three years to identify locations operating below UC Davis, City of Davis, Yolo County, Solano County, or Caltrans LOS thresholds and to identify improvements to restore operations to an acceptable level.

LRDP Mitigation 4.14-2(c) UC Davis shall review individual projects proposed under the 2003 LRDP as they advance through the environmental clearance phase of development to determine if intersection or roadway improvements are needed with the additional traffic generated by the proposed project. If intersection operations are found to degrade to unacceptable levels, UC Davis shall contribute its fair share towards roadway improvements at affected study intersections, as described below.

- *Russell Boulevard/Orchard Park Drive intersection.* Restrict access to right-turns in/out only at the Russell Boulevard/Orchard Park Drive intersection, or widen the northbound approach to include separate left and right-turn lanes and provide a 50-foot refuge area in the median on Russell Boulevard.
- *First Street/A Street intersection.* Construct a roundabout or install a traffic signal.
- *Richards Boulevard/I-80 Ramps intersection.* Reconstruct the north side of the interchange to remove the loop on and off ramps and replace with new ramps in diamond configuration, including traffic signals at ramp terminal intersections.
- *Richards Boulevard/Research Park Drive intersection.* Widen the eastbound Richards Boulevard approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane, a through lane, and a shared through/right-turn lane.
- *Weave section on northbound SR 113 between Hutchison Drive and Russell Boulevard.* Widen the SR 113 Northbound off-ramp onto Russell Boulevard to provide two lanes. One off-ramp lane would serve the auxiliary lane between Hutchison Drive and Russell Boulevard and the second off-ramp lane would serve the SR 113 mainline.
- *Ramp junctions at the I-80/Pedrick Road interchange.* Widen I-80 to provide four travel lanes in each direction in the vicinity of the Pedrick Road interchange.
- *I-80 mainline east of Mace Boulevard.* Widen I-80 to provide a high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction between Richards Boulevard and Mace Boulevard and east of Mace Boulevard.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.14-2(a), 4-14-2(b), and 4-14-2(c) will reduce the overall effect of the project on off-campus intersection and freeway operations. However, the feasibility and/or implementation of roadway improvements cannot be guaranteed by UC Davis. For this reason, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable**

**because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- c. Impact 4.14-3 Additional Parking Demand.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would create additional parking demand. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.14-3(a) UC Davis shall continue to actively pursue Transportation Demand Management strategies to reduce parking demand.

LRDP Mitigation 4.14-3(b) UC Davis shall continue to monitor parking demand on a quarterly basis to identify campus parking areas with a parking utilization over 90 percent. UC Davis shall provide additional parking if a proposed project is expected to increase the winter utilization rate to over 90 percent on the central campus, Health Sciences District, and/or major facilities of the west and south campus.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.14-3(a) and 4.14-3(b), will reduce the potentially significant impact on parking to a less-than-significant level.**

- d. Impact 4.14-4 Increased Demand for Transit Services.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase demand for transit services. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.14-4 UC Davis shall monitor transit ridership to identify routes operating over capacity with increased campus growth. UC Davis shall work with transit providers to identify additional service required with campus growth or new transit routes needed to serve future development areas.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.14-4 will reduce the potentially significant impact on transit services to a less-than-significant level.**

- e. Impact 4.14-5 Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety.* Growth in population levels in the core area of the central campus would result in increased conflicts between bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit vehicles, causing increased congestion and safety problems. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.14-5 UC Davis shall monitor core area pedestrian and bike activity and accidents. UC Davis shall improve bike and pedestrian facilities or alter transit operations to avoid increased bicycle accident rates or safety problems.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.14-5 will reduce the potentially significant impact on bicycle and pedestrian safety to a less-than-significant level.**

## 15. Utilities

- a. *Impact 4.15-1 Domestic/Fire Water Systems.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of campus domestic/fire water extraction and conveyance systems, which would not cause significant environmental impacts. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.15-1(a) Once preliminary project design is developed, the campus shall review each project to determine if existing domestic/fire water supply is adequate at the point of connection. If domestic/fire water is determined inadequate, the campus will upgrade the system to provide adequate water flow and pressure to the project site before constructing the project.

LRDP Mitigation 4.15-1(b) Implement domestic water conservation strategies as indicated in LRDP Mitigation 4.8-5(a).

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the impact associated with expansion of the campus domestic/fire water systems resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP is less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required. Implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.15-1(a) and 4-15-1(b) would further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- b. *Impact 4.15-2 Utility Water Systems.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of campus utility water extraction and conveyance systems, which would not cause significant environmental impacts. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.15-2(a) Once preliminary project design is developed, the campus shall review each project to determine if existing utility water supply is adequate at the point of connection. If the utility water supply is determined to be inadequate, the campus will upgrade the system to provide adequate water flow to the project site prior to occupation or operation.

LRDP Mitigation 4.15-2(b) Implement utility water conservation strategies as indicated in LRDP Mitigation 4.8-6(a).

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the impact associated with expansion of the campus utility water systems resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP is less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required. Implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.15-2(a) and 4-15-2(b) would further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- c. *Impact 4.15-3 Wastewater Treatment and Conveyance Systems.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of campus

utility water extraction and conveyance systems, which would not cause significant environmental impacts. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.15-3 Once preliminary project design is developed, the campus shall review each project to determine whether existing capacity of the sanitary sewer line at the point of connection is adequate. If the capacity of the sewer line is determined inadequate, the campus will upgrade the system to provide adequate service to the project site prior to occupation or operation.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the impact associated with expansion of the campus wastewater treatment and conveyance facilities resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP is less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.15-3 would further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- d. *Impact 4.15-4 Storm Drainage and Detention Systems.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of campus storm drainage conveyance and detention facilities, which would not result in significant environmental impacts. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.15-4 Once preliminary project design is developed, the campus shall review each project to determine whether existing storm drainage system is adequate at the point of connection. If the storm drainage system is determined inadequate, the campus will upgrade the system to provide adequate storm water drainage and/or detention prior to occupation or operation.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the impact associated with expansion of the campus storm drainage conveyance and detention facilities resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP is less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.15-4 would further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

*Impact 4.15-5 Expansion of Landfills.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase the volume of municipal solid waste that would require disposal, but would not require an expansion of the campus or county landfills. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the impact of the increased volume of municipal solid waste resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP is less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

- e. *Impact 4.15-6 Campus Electrical System.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of the campus electrical system, which would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.15-6(a) Once preliminary project design is developed, the campus shall review each project to determine whether the existing electrical system is adequate at the point of connection. If the electrical system is determined inadequate, the campus will upgrade the system to provide adequate service to the project prior to occupation or operation.

LRDP Mitigation 4.15-6(b) The campus would continue to meet or exceed Title 24 energy conservation requirements for new buildings, and it would continue to incorporate energy efficient design elements outlined in the *UC Davis Campus Standards & Design Guide* in new construction and retrofit projects. These energy conservation standards may be subject to modification as more stringent standards are developed.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the impact associated with expansion of the campus electrical system resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP is less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required. Implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.15-6(a) and 4.15-6(b) would further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- f. *Impact 4.15-7 Natural Gas Transmission Systems.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of natural gas transmission systems, which would result in environmental impacts. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.15-7(a) Once preliminary project design is developed, the campus shall review each project to determine whether existing capacity of the natural gas supply pipeline at the point of connection is adequate. If the capacity of the pipeline is determined inadequate, the system will be updated to provide adequate service to the project site prior to occupation or operation.

LRDP Mitigation 4.15-7(b) To minimize disturbance to archaeological resources associated with CA-Yol-118, PG&E can and should implement directional drilling or other alternative means to trenching, or should have a qualified archaeological monitor present and provide a representative of the local Native American community an opportunity to monitor during construction.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.15-7(a) and 4.15-7(b) will reduce the overall impact of the expansion of natural gas transmission systems resulting from the project; however, these mitigation measures will not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Due to uncertainties associated with the effectiveness and feasibility of the mitigation measure, the impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- g. *Impact 4.15-8 Chilled Water and Steam Facilities.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of campus chilled water and steam generation and conveyance facilities. The impact is less than significant.

LRDP Mitigation 4.15-8 Once preliminary project design is developed, the campus shall review each project to determine whether existing capacity of the chilled water and/or steam system at the point of connection is adequate. If the capacity of the pipelines is determined inadequate, the campus will upgrade the system to provide adequate service to the project site prior to occupation or operation.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the impact associated with expansion of the campus chilled water and steam facilities resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP is less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.15-8 would further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- h. *Impact 4.15-9 Campus Communication Facilities.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of campus communication facilities, which would not result in significant environmental impacts. This is a less-than-significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.15-9 Once preliminary project design is developed, the campus shall review each project to determine whether existing capacity of the telecommunications system is adequate. If the capacity is determined to be inadequate, the campus will upgrade the system to provide adequate service to the project site prior to occupation or operation.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the impact associated with expansion of campus communication facilities resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP is less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.15- 9 would further reduce this less-than-significant impact.**

- i. *Impact 4.15-10 Expansion of Wastewater Treatment Facilities-- Cumulative.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP together with other regional development could generate a cumulative demand for wastewater treatment facilities in the region, the construction of which could result in significant environmental impacts on habitat. This is a significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.15-10 If documented unmitigated significant environmental impacts are caused by the construction of wastewater treatment facilities in the Cities of Davis, Dixon, Woodland, and/or Winters that are needed in part due to implementation of the 2003 LRDP, UC Davis shall negotiate with the appropriate local jurisdiction to determine the campus' fair share (as described in Section 4.12.2.3 [of the Final EIR]) of the costs to

implement any feasible and required environmental mitigation measures so long as the unmitigated impacts have not been otherwise reduced to less-than-significant levels through regulatory requirements, public funding, or agreements. This mitigation measure shall not apply to any other costs associated with implementation of utilities or service systems.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.15-10 will reduce the overall effect of the campus contribution to impacts to habitat from construction of wastewater treatment facilities in the region; however, because the ability to avoid significant impacts is not within the control of the University, these mitigation measures will not reduce this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.E of these findings.**

- j. *Impact 4.15-11 Water Supply, Landfills, Energy, and Natural Gas-- Cumulative.* Implementation of the 2003 LRDP together with other regional development could generate a cumulative demand for water, landfills, energy, and natural gas in the region, but the expansion of associated utilities and service systems to meet this demand would not result in significant environmental effects. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the cumulative impact associated with increased demand for water, landfills, energy, and natural gas resulting from implementation of the 2003 LRDP in conjunction with other regional development is less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.**

### C. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(d) require the lead agency approving a project to adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to ensure compliance during project implementation. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program adopted by the Board of Regents requires the University to monitor mitigation measures designed to reduce or eliminate significant impacts, as well as those mitigation measures designed to reduce environmental impacts which are less than significant. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program includes all of the Mitigation Measures identified in the Final EIR and has been designed to ensure compliance during implementation of the 2003 LRDP. The Board of Regents hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Program attached hereto and incorporated herein.

The Board of Regents finds that the impacts of the 2003 LRDP have been mitigated to the extent feasible by the Mitigation Measures identified in the Final EIR and in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The Board of Regents adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the 2003 LRDP that accompanies the Final EIR. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program designates responsibility and anticipated timing for the implementation of mitigation for conditions within the jurisdiction of the University. Implementation of the Mitigation Measures specified in the Final EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will be accomplished through administrative controls over Project planning and implementation, and monitoring and enforcement of these measures will be accomplished through verification in periodic Mitigation Monitoring Reports and periodic inspection by appropriate University personnel. The University reserves the right to make amendments and/or substitutions of Mitigation Measures if, in the exercise of discretion of the University, it is determined that the amended or substituted Mitigation Measure will mitigate the identified potential environmental impact to at least the same degree as the original Mitigation Measure, or would attain an adopted performance standard for mitigation, and where the amendment or substitution would not result in a new significant impact on the environment which cannot be mitigated.

#### **D. ALTERNATIVES**

The EIR evaluated a range of alternatives to the 2003 LRDP in Section 5 of the Final EIR. In compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the alternatives analysis also included an analysis of a No Project Alternative and discussed the environmentally superior alternative. The EIR examined the feasibility of each alternative, the environmentally superior alternative, the environmental impacts of each alternative, and the ability of each alternative to meet the project objectives as identified in Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR. Table 5-4 in the Draft EIR compares the environmental impacts of the proposed project and each of the alternatives. The Regents certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on alternatives provided in the Final EIR and the record of proceedings. The Regents finds that when compared to the alternatives analyzed in the Final EIR (including the No Project Alternative), the project as proposed and mitigated provides a reasonable balance between maximizing satisfaction of the project objectives and minimizing significant environmental impacts. The Regents further finds that all the alternatives are infeasible, as that term is defined by CEQA, and shall be rejected in favor of the project as proposed, for the reasons set forth below.

##### **1. Project Objectives**

The Regents finds that the objectives for the project are as described in Section 3.4 of the Draft EIR. The overall project objective is to support the teaching, research and public service missions of the University of California. The overarching objectives of the proposed 2003 LRDP are as follows:

- Meet the LRDP growth target, as detailed in the Growth Program included in the LRDP.

- Create a physical framework to support the teaching, research, and public service mission of the campus. The physical framework should be flexible, recognize that campuses are lasting environments with long traditions, support a dynamic teaching environment, an accessible research environment, and an interactive and welcoming public service environment.
- Manage campus lands resources in a spirit of stewardship for the future by creating a healthy and interconnected natural and built environment and by conserving natural resources.
- Provide an environment to enrich campus life and serve the greater community by creating gathering places that promote interaction between and among students, faculty, staff, alumni, visitors, and community members; fostering a safe environment; retaining and expanding the environmental features that give the campus its distinct identity and that establish continuity in the landscape from generation to generation; sustaining and expanding the residential character of UC Davis.

In addition to these primary objectives, the 2003 LRDP identifies numerous specific objectives under separate sections on campus resources, planning areas, and campus land uses.

## **2. Alternatives to the 2003 LRDP**

The University evaluated five alternatives to the 2003 LRDP: Reduced Enrollment Growth; Higher Enrollment Growth; Central Campus Infill (Higher Density); No Neighborhood/No Research Park; and No Project.

### **i. Reduced Enrollment Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Enrollment Growth Alternative, the future development of the campus would be planned to accommodate 28,000 students on campus, rather than the 30,000 students proposed under the proposed 2003 LRDP. Overall campus development would be reduced proportionately to the student population, but the Neighborhood and Research Park components of the proposed project would be included as proposed under the 2003 LRDP. As a result of the reduced campus population overall, housing needs, utility development and use, support services, and development of academic and administrative uses would be reduced relative to the proposed project.

This alternative would result in impacts that would be roughly equal with or less significant than the project as proposed. Impacts that would be significant under the proposed project would generally be somewhat reduced by the alternative due to the smaller scale of development under this alternative, but most of these impacts would still be significant.

This alternative was rejected because it would not allow the campus to fully realize its goal of responding to the increased demand for higher education in California.

**ii. Higher Growth Enrollment Alternative**

The Higher Enrollment Growth Alternative assumes an enrollment growth of twice that proposed under the proposed 2003 LRDP. This would represent an increase of about 61 percent over the current on-campus population, and about 15 percent over the proposed 2003 LRDP projections for 2015-16. The basic design objectives of the 2003 LRDP, and proposed development components including the Neighborhood and the Research Park, would be maintained. The increased population growth associated with the Higher Enrollment Growth Alternative would entail a demand for increased academic and administrative and other space on campus on the order of approximately 15 percent above the level of the 2003 LRDP.

Under this alternative, most impacts would be incrementally more significant than under the project as proposed, due to the larger scale of development under this alternative. Certain impacts, such as those associated with public services required to serve the Neighborhood, would be roughly equal under this alternative and the project as proposed.

This alternative would meet increases in long-term enrollment demand to a greater degree than would the proposed project and, assuming that the alternative would include the same development program as the proposed project, the alternative would meet the LRDP goal of developing a physical environment to support the teaching, research, and public service mission of the campus. This alternative was rejected because the increased development that likely would be associated with the larger population generated by the alternative would make it more difficult for the campus to meet the project's objective of managing campus lands and resources in a spirit of stewardship.

**iii. Central Campus Infill (Higher Density) Alternative**

Under the Central Campus Infill (Higher Density) Alternative, the same population growth anticipated under the 2003 LRDP would be accommodated on campus, but the proposed I-80 Research Park and the new Neighborhood proposed for a site west of SR 113 would not use the proposed sites, but instead would be sited as infill on the central campus. The principal components of the Neighborhood would instead be built on the central campus in an area that is currently used for student fields, a student cooperative housing community, research greenhouses, and surface parking. The site is proposed for Community Gardens and Student Housing land use designations under the 2003 LRDP. This site is less than half the size that would be needed to accommodate the Neighborhood development as proposed, so the density of the housing would be significantly higher than proposed. Research Park uses included in the proposed project would be located on the presently undeveloped 20+ acre parcel north of I-80 and west of the South Entry parking structure.

This alternative would result in similar or lower impacts compared to the proposed project with respect to most resource areas with the exception of aesthetics, cultural resources, construction noise, and parking, where the impacts of this alternative could be greater. This alternative would meet most of the objectives of the proposed project through the use of infill and higher density development in areas that are already developed. This alternative was rejected because the intensive development of the core campus under this alternative would

severely limit future expansion of specific buildings or academic programs because of space constraints, and could thus constrain the pursuit of future academic and research initiatives, which will be important in the campus' future. Furthermore, focus on development in the central core of the campus could alter campus aesthetics, and would concentrate traffic, air quality, and other population-related impacts, such that the quality of campus life could be impaired.

**iv. No Neighborhood/No Research Park Alternative**

The No Neighborhood/No Research Park Alternative assumes the same campus population growth and associated development as the 2003 LRDP and eliminates the Neighborhood and/or the Research Park components. Unlike the Central Campus Infill Alternative discussed above, under this alternative, uses associated with those areas would not be accommodated on campus. The location and intensity of the proposed development elsewhere on campus would remain the same as identified in the 2003 LRDP.

Under this alternative, the significance of most impacts would be reduced relative to the 2003 LRDP as proposed because the Neighborhood and Research Park would not be constructed. A few significant impacts, such as the impact on scenic vistas, would be eliminated. Impacts associated with regional growth would be roughly equal to those that would result from the 2003 LRDP as proposed because the increase in students, staff, and faculty would be the same. Some impacts, such as those on parking and traffic, would be increased under this alternative relative to the 2003 LRDP as proposed because students, staff, and faculty who would have lived in the Neighborhood would have longer commutes and would be more likely to drive to campus.

This alternative was rejected because it would not be consistent with the campus' long-range objective of creating a physical framework to support the teaching, research, and public service mission of the campus. Without the Neighborhood component, it would be more difficult for the campus to recruit high-quality faculty and students because opportunities to live in the campus community and participate fully in campus life, and long-term housing affordability would not be provided. Without the Research Park, the campus would have less opportunity to expand the range of educational, internship, employment and career opportunities in close proximity to the campus.

**v. No Project Alternative**

In accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the Final EIR evaluates the "No Project Alternative," which compares the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving it. The No Project Alternative describes the environmental conditions existing at the time of publication of the Notice of Preparation, along with a discussion of what would be reasonably expected to occur at the site in the foreseeable future, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.

Under the No Project Alternative, there essentially would be no increase in enrollment after 2004-05. Student-induced growth in faculty and staff would also not occur. However, there would be a small growth in research-related population and staff. Future development plans would be curtailed commensurately. Future building projects through 2015-16 would be limited to those currently approved, those required for health and safety reasons, or those related to the growth in research activities. This growth would be largely confined to the central campus and adjacent to existing development on the west and south campuses.

Under this alternative, all impacts would be reduced relative to the 2003 LRDP as proposed, although some impacts would remain significant as a result of construction associated with growth in research programs.

This alternative was rejected because it would meet only one of the four principal objectives of the proposed LRDP, the management of campus lands in a spirit of stewardship. The University would be unable to meet the enrollment projections for the University of California system; would have limited ability to fulfill the teaching, research, and public service mission of the campus; and would be unable to provide an environment to enrich campus life and serve the greater community.

#### **vi. Environmentally Superior Alternative**

The Regents finds that, in the short term, the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative because it would avoid almost all environmental impacts of the development under the 2003 LRDP. If, however, the campus does not accommodate its share of the University's projected enrollment demand, the University would pursue other alternatives to meet the demand, including additional growth on other campuses, which would result in impacts that cannot be known at this time.

The Regents further finds that other than the No Project Alternative, the Campus Infill (Higher Density) Alternative is environmentally superior to the project. This alternative would result in similar or lower impacts to the proposed project with respect to most resource areas with the exception of aesthetics, cultural resources, construction noise, and parking, where the impacts of this alternative could be greater. It would be superior to the proposed project in that existing open space and prime farmland outside the central campus, and the teaching and research fields that are critical in campus programs, would be preserved to the greatest extent possible. On balance, the Campus Infill (Higher Density) Alternative is environmentally superior to the proposed project but it would not support the objective of responding to academic needs or expanded initiatives, could alter campus aesthetics, and would concentrate population-related impacts such that the quality of campus life could be impaired.

### **E. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

#### **1. Impacts That Remain Significant**

As discussed above, The Regents has found that the following impacts of the project remain significant following adoption and implementation of the mitigation measures described in the Final EIR. Mitigation of some of these impacts requires measures that are in the control and jurisdiction of another public agency, and can and should be implemented by those agencies, as described in the Final EIR. If any of those mitigation measures are not implemented by the agencies who can and should implement them, the remaining impact may be significant and unavoidable.

### Impacts of the LRDP:

| Number | Impact   |
|--------|--|
| 4.1-1  | Impact on scenic vistas.   |
| 4.1-4  | Cumulative impact on scenic vistas.  |
| 4.1-5  | Cumulative impact on visual character and quality.   |
| 4.1-6  | Cumulative impact of light and glare.  |
| 4.2-1  | Conversion of prime farmland on campus to nonagricultural use.                                   |
| 4.2-3  | Cumulative impact associated with conversion of prime farmland on campus to nonagricultural use. |
| 4.3-1  | Impact associated with increase emissions of criteria pollutants.                                |
| 4.3-3  | Impact of air emissions from construction activities.  |
| 4.3-6  | Cumulative impact associated with increased emissions of criteria pollutants                     |
| 4.4-11 | Impact on Heritage Trees.  |
| 4.4.12 | Cumulative impact on Swainson's hawk and burrowing owls  |
| 4.4-13 | Cumulative impact on wetland and riparian habitat.   |
| 4.4-14 | Cumulative impact on valley elderberry beetle habitat.   |
| 4.3-6  | Cumulative impact associated with increase of criteria air pollutants.                           |
| 4.5-3  | Impacts on unique archaeological and historical resources.                                       |
| 4.5-5  | Cumulative impact to unique archaeological and historic resources.                               |
| 4.8-5  | Impact of increase groundwater withdrawal from deep aquifer.                                     |
| 4.8-6  | Impact on shallow/intermediate aquifer.  |
| 4.8-10 | Cumulative impact associated with increased storm water runoff and receiving                     |

| Number  | Impact   |
|---------|--|
|         | water quality.   |
| 4.8-13  | Cumulative impact on deep aquifer.   |
| 4.8-14  | Cumulative impact on shallow/intermediate aquifer.                                 |
| 4.10-5  | Cumulative impact on ambient noise levels.   |
| 4.11-1  | Population growth inducement.  |
| 4.12-3  | Impact associated with provision of fire services.                                 |
| 4.12-6  | Cumulative impact associated with provision of police and fire services.           |
| 4.12-7  | Cumulative impact associated with construction of school facilities.               |
| 4.13-2  | Cumulative impact associated with development of recreation facilities.            |
| 4.14-2  | Impact on intersection and freeway operations.                                     |
| 4.15-7  | Impact associated with expansion of natural gas transmission systems.              |
| 4.15-10 | Cumulative impact associated with construction of wastewater treatment facilities. |

## 2. Overriding Considerations

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, The Regents has, in determining whether or not to approve the project, balanced the economic, social, technological and other benefits of the project against its unavoidable environmental risks, and has found that the benefits of the project outweigh the significant adverse environmental effects that are not mitigated to less-than-significant levels, for the reasons set forth below. This statement of overriding considerations is based on The Regents' review of the Final EIR and other information in the administrative record, including but not limited to the 2003 LRDP.

A. The University is charged, under the California Master Plan for Higher Education, with providing the opportunity for undergraduate education to those California's who graduate in the top one-eighth of their high school class. The University is also charged with admitting those students who complete coursework in the lower division transfer curriculum at community colleges and who meet minimum grade point average requirements. The University serves as the state's primary research agency and is the primary public institution in the state offering doctoral and certain professional degrees.

B. Current projections indicate that the number of students seeking admission to college in California will grow by approximately 30 percent by the year 2010. This increased demand will require the University to accommodate an additional 63,000± students for the

period 1998-99 to 2010-11. Accordingly, the 2003 LRDP will help provide the additional capacity necessary to accommodate expected increased in student demand to 2010 and beyond.

C. The 2003 LRDP will advance California's economic, social and cultural development, which depends upon broad access to an educational system that prepares all of the state's inhabitants for responsible citizenship and meaningful careers.

D. The 2003 LRDP supports the campus in its objective of creating a physical framework to support the teaching, research, and public service mission of the campus, including a dynamic teaching environment, an accessible research environment, ease of interdisciplinary collaboration, and an interactive and welcoming public service environment.

E. The 2003 LRDP will provide housing for approximately 5,000 additional students and designates land for approximately 500 faculty and staff housing units, enabling the campus to sustain and expand its residential character and provide opportunities for members of the campus community to live locally and participate fully in the life of the campus. Meeting a portion of the increased demand for affordable housing within the local community is expected to help the campus recruit high quality faculty.

F. The 2003 LRDP will allow for the development of approximately 2.5 million assignable square feet of academic and administrative facilities to remedy existing and future space shortages, correct deficiencies and technological obsolescence in existing facilities, accommodate planned program direction in instruction, research and public service functions, and provide capacity for future program requirements.

G. The 2003 LRDP will constitute a significant economic benefit to the Davis area. UC Davis has a significant economic impact on the area's economy. The total economic impact of UC Davis in the Davis area is much greater than the sum of the direct expenditures made by UC Davis and its affiliated organizations and populations. Each dollar spent locally by UC Davis cycles through the area economy, generating additional income and employment.

H. UC Davis provides many direct services for both on-campus and off-campus users, including but not limited to: police protection and rescue services; library services; recreation services; animal health services; and other academic and support services. As the 2003 LRDP is implemented, the level of these services will grow.

I. UC Davis provides many indirect community contributions in the form of education, artistic, and cultural enrichment to residents of the Davis area through such functions as extension courses, performing arts events, art exhibits, sporting events, conferences and workshops.

J. The campus is the largest employer in the Davis area and one of the largest employers in the Sacramento Valley. This is particularly significant because of the quality and diversity of new jobs which are related to the implementation of the 2003 LRDP.

K. The increased economic activity resulting from campus growth is also expected to result in secondary growth in non-University businesses in the Davis area.

Implementation of the 2003 LRDP will also provide construction employment as individual building projects are developed.

L. When compared to the alternatives analyzed in the Final EIR (including the No Project Alternative), the 2003 LRDP provides the best available balance between maximizing attainment of the project objectives and minimizing significant environmental impacts.

**F. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

Various documents and other materials constitute the record of proceedings upon which the Regents bases its findings and decisions contained herein. Most documents related to this project are located in the Office of Resource Management and Planning in Mrak Hall, Third Floor, University of California, One Shields Avenue, Davis, California 95616. The custodian for these records of proceedings is the Office of Resource Management and Planning.

**G. SUMMARY**

1. Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, The Regents has made one of more of the following Findings with respect to the significant environmental effects identified in the Final EIR:

a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects on the environment.

b. Those changes or alterations are wholly or partially within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other public agency.

c. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the Final EIR that would otherwise avoid or substantially lessen the identified significant environmental effects of the project.

2. Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, it is hereby determined that:

a. All significant effects on the environment due to approval of the project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.

b. Any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the factors described Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section II.E, above.

### **III. APPROVALS**

The Regents hereby takes the following actions:

- A. The Regents has certified the Final EIR in Section I., above.
- B. The Regents hereby adopts as conditions of approval of the 2003 LRDP all mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the University set forth in Section II.B of the Findings, above.
- C. The Regents hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the project and discussed in Section II.C of the Findings, above.
- D. The Regents hereby adopts these findings in their entirety as its findings for these actions and approvals.
- E. Having certified the Final EIR, independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR, incorporated mitigation measures into the project, and adopted findings and a statement of overriding considerations, The Regents hereby approves the Long Range Development Plan for the University of California, Davis Campus.