

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS IN  
CONNECTION WITH DESIGN APPROVAL OF THE  
NORTH ADDITION OFFICE BUILDING PROJECT,  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS  
SACRAMENTO CAMPUS**

On November 18, 2010, the Board of Regents of the University of California (“The Regents”), as Lead Agency, certified the Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2010 University of California, Davis (“UC Davis” or “the Campus”) Sacramento Campus Long Range Development Plan (“2010 LRDP EIR”). The 2010 LRDP EIR was assigned State Clearinghouse No. 2009112060. The 2010 LRDP EIR analyzes, at a program level, the environmental effects of implementing the 2010 LRDP, which proposed a program of campus growth through the year 2025. Following certification of the 2010 LRDP EIR, The Regents approved the 2010 LRDP and now proposes to approve as a component of the 2010 LRDP, the design of the North Addition Office Building project.

Pursuant to Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 15090, The Regents hereby certifies that the Final Focused Tiered Environmental Impact Report (“Final EIR” or, collectively with the Draft EIR, “EIR”) (State Clearinghouse No. 2015072012) for the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project (“proposed project” or “project”) for the University of California, Davis, Sacramento Campus has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq. (“CEQA”). The Regents further certifies that the Final EIR was presented to The Regents and that The Regents has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to approving the design for the proposed project, as set forth below in Section III. As part of this certification, The Regents hereby finds that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of The Regents. The conclusions presented in these Findings are based upon the Final EIR and other evidence in the administrative record.

The Final EIR evaluated multiple projects associated with the upcoming development plans at the UC Davis Sacramento Campus, and at this time, The Regents is considering approval of the North Addition Office Building, the first project from Final EIR proposed for certification. Subsequent consideration of additional projects evaluated in the Final EIR will include review of project-specific CEQA findings prior to approval.

**I. FINDINGS**

Having received, reviewed and considered the Final EIR and other information in the administrative record, The Regents hereby adopts the following Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the University of California’s procedures for implementing CEQA. The Regents adopts these Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations in conjunction with its certification of the Final EIR and approval of the design of the North Addition Office Building project as set forth in Section II, below.

## **A. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS**

### ***1. Preparation of the EIR***

The project analyzed in the Final EIR is described in Section 3.0 of the Draft EIR and Section 2.0 of the Final EIR. The UC Davis Health System (“UCDHS”) proposes to implement the proposed project to improve seismic safety and provide replacement office space at the Sacramento campus. The projects evaluated in the Final EIR include: (1) the construction of the approximately 130,000 gross square foot (“GSF”) North Addition Office Building; (2) demolition of the approximately 235,000 GSF North/South Main Hospital Wing, and the subsequent ‘re-skinning’ of the remaining hospital structures; and (3) the demolition of the approximately 20,000 GSF Housestaff Building. In total, the projects would reduce building space on the Sacramento campus by approximately 125,000 GSF.

A Tiered Initial Study and a Focused Tiered Draft EIR (“Draft EIR”) were prepared for the project in accordance with CEQA and the University of California procedures for implementing CEQA. The environmental analyses in these documents are tiered from the UC Davis 2010 LRDP EIR in accordance with Sections 15152 and 15168(c) of the CEQA Guidelines. In compliance with CEQA and the State and University of California Guidelines for implementation of CEQA, the 2010 LRDP was approved and the accompanying Final 2010 LRDP EIR, State Clearinghouse No. 2009112060, was certified by The Regents on November 18, 2010.

The project is part of the physical development proposed in the 2010 LRDP, therefore, the environmental analysis for the project is presented and analyzed within the context of the 2010 LRDP and incorporates by reference applicable portions of the 2010 LRDP EIR. The 2010 LRDP EIR, which is a program EIR pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines, analyzed the overall effects of campus growth and facility development through 2025 and identified measures to mitigate the significant adverse project impacts and cumulative impacts associated with that growth.

The tiering of the environmental analysis for the project allowed the Initial Study and Draft EIR to rely on the 2010 LRDP EIR for: (1) a discussion of general background and setting information for environmental topic areas; (2) overall growth-related issues; (3) issues that were evaluated in sufficient detail in the 2010 LRDP EIR for which there is no significant new information or change in circumstances that would require further analysis; and (4) long-term cumulative impacts. The purpose of the Tiered Initial Study was to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the project with respect to the existing 2010 LRDP EIR analysis to determine what level of additional environmental review, if any, is appropriate.

The Tiered Initial Study determined that implementation of the proposed project would not adversely affect agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, land use and planning, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, or recreation, and that further evaluation of these topics was not required in the project Draft EIR. However, inadequate information regarding aesthetics (light and glare), air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, potential release of hazardous materials (mainly due to demolition activities), hydrology and water quality, noise (due to construction), traffic, and utility demand and points of connection was available during the preparation of the Tiered Initial Study to evaluate the significance of impacts relative to these topics. Therefore, the Draft EIR for the project further evaluates the significance of impacts in these areas.

The campus published a Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) and Tiered Initial Study indicating that a Tiered Focused Draft EIR would be prepared for the project, in July 2015. The public and agency review of the NOP and Tiered Initial Study extended from July 8, 2015 to August 12, 2015. A public scoping meeting on the project was held on July 15, 2015. A total of seven comments were received on the NOP and Initial Study, two from agencies and five from individuals.

The Notice of Completion (“NOC”) and Draft EIR for the project were published on August 26, 2015 (State Clearinghouse No. 2015072012). 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 Draft EIR, appeared in the Sacramento Bee, the local paper of public record, on August 26, 2015. The public and agency review period extended from August 26, 2015 through October 12, 2015. During that time, the Draft EIR was reviewed by various governmental agencies, as well as interested individuals and organizations. A total of two agencies, two organizations, and 32 individuals provided comments during the circulation period for the Draft EIR. In addition, members of the public were invited by formal public notice to submit comments on the Draft EIR in testimony at a public hearing held for that purpose on September 21, 2015. Four commenters spoke at the public hearing.

The comments received during the public review period are addressed in the Final EIR. The comments pertained primarily to the following issues: (1) concerns regarding the demolition of the Housestaff Building and the North/South Hospital Wing; (2) concerns regarding traffic in the project vicinity during construction; (3) concerns regarding noise in the project vicinity during construction; (4) concerns regarding air quality in the project vicinity during construction; and (5) concerns regarding light and glare in the project vicinity during construction and operations. In response to these comments, clarification was provided regarding the adequacy of the original analysis; no new or additional information was presented in the Final EIR on these issues.

The Final EIR, which includes, among other components, the Tiered Initial Study published in July 2015, Draft EIR published in August 2015 and campus responses to comments received during the public review period for the Draft EIR, was published in October 2015. The Final EIR contains all of the comments received during the public comment period, 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 certifies that it has reviewed the comments received and responses thereto and finds that the Final EIR provides adequate, good faith and reasoned responses to the comments. The analysis and conclusions contained in the Final EIR reflect the independent judgment of The Regents.

## ***2. 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 includes: (i) changes to the project; (ii) changes in the environmental setting; or (iii) additional data or other information. Section 15088.5 further provides that “[n]ew 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 (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement.”

Having reviewed the information contained in the Draft and Final EIRs and in the administrative record as well as the requirements under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 and interpretive judicial authority regarding recirculation of draft EIRs, The Regents hereby finds that no new significant information was added to the EIR following public review and thus, recirculation of the EIR is not required by CEQA.

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

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

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 from the EIR, describe the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and state The Regents' findings on the significance of each impact with 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.

In adopting mitigation measures as set forth below, The Regents intends to adopt each of the mitigation measures recommended 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 fails 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.

With respect to measures that were suggested in the comments, and not included in the Final EIR, the responses to comments explain either that the suggested mitigation measures are already part of ongoing campus programs and procedures or that they are infeasible and thus not recommended for adoption. The Regents hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the reasons stated in the responses to comments as the grounds for finding these suggested mitigation measures to be infeasible.

### ***1. Project Impacts that are Less Than Significant without Mitigation***

The Final EIR found that the following impacts from the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project would be less than significant without mitigation: impacts to aesthetics (see Draft EIR Section 4.1, Impact AES-1 and Cumulative Impact AES-1); agricultural resources (see Tiered Initial Study); air quality (see Draft EIR Section 4.2, Impact AIR-1, Impact AIR-2, Impact AIR-3, Impact AIR-4, Impact AIR-5, Cumulative Impact AIR-1, and Cumulative Impact AIR-2); biological resources (see Tiered Initial Study); cultural resources (see Tiered Initial Study); geology and soils (see Tiered Initial Study); greenhouse gas emissions (see Draft EIR Section 4.3, Impact GHG-1 and Impact GHG-2); hazards and hazardous materials (see Tiered Initial Study and Draft EIR Section 4.4, Impact HAZ-1, Impact HAZ-2, Impact HAZ-3, and Impact HAZ-4); hydrology and water quality (see Tiered Initial Study and Draft EIR Section 4.5, Impact HYDRO-1 and Cumulative Impact HYDRO-1); land use and planning (see Tiered Initial Study); mineral resources (see Tiered Initial Study); noise (see Draft EIR Section 4.6, Impact NOI-2, Impact NOI-3, Impact NOI-4, Impact NOI-5 and Cumulative Impact NOI-1); population and housing (see Tiered Initial Study); public services (see Tiered Initial Study); recreation (see Tiered Initial Study); transportation and traffic (see Tiered Initial Study and Draft EIR Section 4.7, Cumulative Impact TRA-1); and utilities and service systems, including energy (see Draft EIR Section 4.8, Impact UTIL-1, Impact UTIL-2, Impact UTIL-3, Impact UTIL-4, Impact UTIL-5, Impact UTIL-6, Impact UTIL-7, Impact UTIL-8, and Cumulative Impact UTIL-1).

## ***2. Project Impacts that are Less Than Significant but Mitigation is Incorporated to Further Reduce the Impact***

### ***i. Air Quality***

*Impact AIR-1: Construction of the proposed project would not result in construction emissions that violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.*

The following LRDP Mitigation Measures are included in and a part of the project as proposed:

LRDP MM AIR-1a: For each construction project on the campus, the project contractor will implement the following PM10 and PM2.5 control measures, as appropriate:

- Water exposed soil with adequate frequency to minimize fugitive dust. However, the contractor shall not overwater to the extent that sediment flows off the site.
- Suspend excavation, grading, and/or demolition activity when wind speeds exceed 20 mph.
- Install wind breaks (e.g., solid fencing) on windward side(s) of construction areas.
- Plant vegetative ground cover in disturbed areas as soon as possible. Water appropriately until vegetation is established.
- Prevent soil from leaving the construction site (e.g., install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off all trucks as equipment leaving the site; Treat site accesses to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road with a 6- to 12-inch layer of wood chips, mulch, or gravel to reduce generation of road dust carryout onto public roads).
- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The phone number of the District shall also be visible to ensure compliance.

LRDP MM AIR-1b: For each construction project on the campus, the University shall require that the project include a construction emissions control plan that includes a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 horsepower, that will be used for an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of the construction project. The inventory shall include the horsepower rating, engine production year, and projected hours of use for each piece of equipment. The inventory shall be updated monthly throughout the duration of the project as needed, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The plan will also include the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman. The plan will also demonstrate that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) self-propelled off road equipment to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project-wide fleet-average 20 percent NOX reduction or greater and 45 percent particulate reduction or greater compared to the most recent CARB fleet average at the time of project construction. The University shall retain a copy of the construction emissions control plan on the campus, which will be made available to the agencies and the public upon request.

**FINDING:** As discussed in the Final EIR, the project would not result in construction emissions that violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation threshold of significance, but this impact would be further reduced by implementation of LRDP MMs AIR-1a and 1b that are included in and a part of the project. Therefore, The Regents finds that the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project would result in less than significant air quality impacts during construction.

*Impact AIR-4: Implementation of the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants.*

The following LRDP Mitigation Measures are included in and a part of the project as proposed:

LRDP MM AIR-4: Because the bulk of the of toxic air contaminants (TAC) emissions resulting in the significant human health risk operational impacts would be emitted by the existing and future stationary sources on the campus such as the Central Energy Plant boilers, and emergency generator testing, a number of potential mitigation measures were identified that focused on these stationary sources. These mitigation measures include the following:

- Limit fuel oil usage to 40 hrs/yr for the Building 34 emergency generator
- Limit natural gas usage to 500,000 Therms per year (each) for existing Central Energy Plant boilers 1, 2, 3, and 4
- Limit natural gas usage to 500,000 Therms per year (each) for future Central Energy Plant boilers 1, 2, and 3
- Remove rain caps from the existing Central Plant boilers and replace with rain sleeves, while increasing overall stack height by 10 feet

**FINDING:** As discussed in the Final EIR, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants, but this impact would be further reduced by implementation of LRDP MM AIR-4 which is included in and a part of the project. Therefore, The Regents finds that the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project would result in less than significant air quality impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants.

*Cumulative Impact AIR-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.*

The following LRDP Mitigation Measures are included in and a part of the project as proposed:

LRDP MM AIR-6: The University will implement LRDP Mitigation Measure AIR-1, which is designed to reduce construction emissions. It will also implement LRDP Mitigation Measure TRA-1 which will reduce traffic-related air pollutant emissions resulting from campus operations. For new and expanded stationary sources on the campus, the University will comply with BACT and offset requirements.

LRDP Cumulative MM AIR-1: The University will work with SACOG to ensure that campus growth is accounted for in the regional population and employment projections so

that the emissions associated with campus growth can be accounted for in the regional air quality plans.

**FINDING:** As discussed in the Final EIR, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard, but this impact would be further reduced by implementation of LRDP MM AIR-6 and LRDP Cumulative MM AIR-1 that are included in and a part of the project. Therefore, The Regents finds that the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project would result in less than significant air quality impacts related to a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

ii. ***Greenhouse Gas Emissions***

*Impact GHG-1: The proposed project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.*

The following LRDP Mitigation Measures are included in and a part of the project as proposed:

LRDP MM GHG-1a: UC Davis shall implement green building design standards for all new construction developed under the 2010 LRDP in accordance with the UC Policy on Sustainable Practices.

- New building projects, other than acute-care facilities, shall outperform the required provisions of the California Energy Code (Title 24) energy-efficiency standards by at least 20 percent.
- New building projects, other than acute-care facilities, shall outperform the required provisions of the California Energy Code (Title 24) energy-efficiency standards by 30 percent or more, whenever possible within the constraints of program needs and standard budget parameters.
- UC Davis shall develop and implement, in consultation with other campuses and medical centers, standards for energy efficiency for new acute-care facilities.
- New building projects, except laboratory and acute care facilities, shall be certified to a minimum standard equivalent to a LEED™-NC “Silver” rating according to the version of LEED™-NC that is current at the time of design approval.
- New building projects, except laboratory and acute care facilities, shall be certified to a minimum standard equivalent to a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED™) “Gold” rating for new construction (NC), whenever possible within the constraints of program needs and standard budget parameters, according to the version of LEED™-NC that is current at the time of design approval.
- New laboratory building projects shall be certified to a minimum standard equivalent to a LEED™-NC “Silver” rating and the Laboratories for the 21st Century (Labs21) Environmental Performance Criteria (EPC), as appropriate. The design process will

include attention to energy efficiency for systems not addressed by the California Energy Code (Title 24).

- New building projects shall achieve at least two of the available credits in the LEED™-NC Water Efficiency category and shall cooperate with local water district in efforts to conserve water and to meet reduced water use goals of the local district.
- New privatized development projects on The Regents' land where the project is to be used for a programmatic or auxiliary purpose (i.e., a University-related purpose) shall comply with the provisions of UC Policy on Sustainable Practices listed herein.
- New building projects built on The Regents' land pursuant to a ground lease by a private, institutional or government entity ("Lessee") for the Lessee's own use (whether in support the University's mission or to generate income for the University) shall abide by the UC Policy provisions listed herein.

LRDP MM GHG-1b: The University of California is developing and UC Davis shall participate in a system-wide portfolio approach to reduce consumption of nonrenewable energy. The portfolio will include a combination of energy efficiency projects, the incorporation of local renewable power measures for existing and new facilities, green power purchases from the electrical grid, and other energy measures with equivalent demonstrable effect on the environment and reduction in fossil fuel usage. UC Davis shall achieve a level of grid-provided electricity from renewable sources that is similar to or greater than the State's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS).

LRDP MM GHG-1c: UC Davis shall implement environmentally preferable purchasing practices for all new construction developed under the 2010 LRDP in accordance with the UC Policy on Sustainable Practices and the UC Davis CAP.

- New building projects shall procure only products with an ENERGY STAR® rating for product categories that have ENERGY STAR® rated products available, consistent with the needs of UC Davis researchers.
- New building projects shall require that suppliers ensure that all electronic equipment and items delivered to the project site enable all energy efficiency and conservation features, if the option exists and is consistent with the needs of the project.
- New building projects shall give preference to technologies that ensure the efficient use of water resources for all products and services that require the use of water (e.g., low-flow water fixtures, water efficient irrigation, etc.).

LRDP MM GHG-1d: UC Davis shall implement transportation reduction measures in accordance with the UC Policy on Sustainable Practices and the UC Davis CAP.

- For all campus-owned fleet vehicles, old equipment scheduled for retirement shall be preferentially replaced with fuel efficient, low emission vehicles (LEV), zero-emission vehicles (ZEV), and/or alternative-fueled vehicles consistent with the needs of the campus.

- UC Davis shall investigate ways to expand or further improve upon the Green Light Commuter Club by providing additional alternative transportation options and incentives, and shall educate students, staff, faculty, and visitors about the program.
- UC Davis shall implement campus-wide policies and programs for reducing vehicle and flight miles traveled through teleconferencing, telecommuting, and telemedicine and shall educate students, staff, faculty, and visitors about these policies and programs.
- UC Davis shall pursue the expansion of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs and projects to reduce the environmental impacts from commuting. TDM programs may include: carshare, carpools (rideshare), vanpools, buspools, campus shuttles, transit, bicycle circulation system, pedestrian circulation system, emergency rides home, telecommuting, flexible schedules, parking management (amount, access, fees), etc. In conjunction with this effort, campuses will engage in advocacy efforts with local transit districts to improve routes in order to better serve student and staff ridership. UC Davis shall educate students, staff, faculty, and visitors about TDM programs.

LRDP MM GHG-1e: UC Davis shall implement further waste reduction and recycling actions to reduce overall contributions to the campus landfill. Waste reduction and recycling actions shall include new purchasing requirements to increase recycled content in consumable materials and improved requirements for purchasing recyclable materials where possible.

LRDP MM GHG-1f: UC Davis shall monitor and report the total annual GHG emissions on a biannual basis. If the total annual increase in emissions from the project exceeds 25,000 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> in 2014 and/or 2020, UC Davis shall buy renewable energy credits, offsets, and/or allowances in accordance with the UC Policy on Sustainable Practices and/or a future cap-and-trade program to reduce the new emissions to below 25,000 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>.

**FINDING: As discussed in the Final EIR, the project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, but this impact would be further reduced by implementation of LRDP MMs GHG-1a through GHG-1f that are included in and a part of the project. Therefore, The Regents finds that the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project would result in less than significant impacts related to generation of greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.**

iii. *Land Use*

*Impact LAN-1: The proposed project would not result in development that would conflict with existing and future adjacent land uses.*

The following LRDP Mitigation Measure is included in and a part of the project as proposed:

LRDP MM LAN-2: Prior to design approval for or authorization to proceed with development projects located along the campus boundary, the University will review project siting and design to ensure that the project conforms to LRDP height limits.

**FINDING:** As discussed in the Final EIR, the project would not result in development that would conflict with existing and future adjacent land uses; this impact would be further reduced by implementation of LRDP MM LAN-2 that is included in and a part of the project. Therefore, The Regents finds that the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project would result in less than significant impacts related to the development that would conflict with existing and future adjacent land uses.

iv. *Noise*

*Impact NOI-2: Construction of the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to excessive ground vibration.*

The following LRDP Mitigation Measure is included in and a part of the project as proposed:

LRDP MM NOI-2: For construction adjacent to off-site residential uses, advance notice will be given to occupants of these uses to ensure that precautions are taken to protect ongoing activities from vibration effects.

**FINDING:** As discussed in the Final EIR, the proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to excessive ground vibration; this impact would be further reduced by implementation of LRDP MM NOI-2 that is included in and a part of the project. Therefore, The Regents finds that the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project would result in a less than significant impact related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive ground vibration.

*Impact NOISE-4: The operation of mechanical equipment on the roof of the proposed building would not result in a substantial long-term increase in ambient noise levels.*

The following LRDP Mitigation Measure is included in and a part of the project as proposed:

LRDP MM NOI-4: Mechanical equipment and building design shall be selected so that noise levels from future building and other facility operations would not exceed the Noise Ordinance limits of the City of Sacramento for commercial areas or residential zones as measured on any noise sensitive receptor in the area surrounding the Sacramento campus. Controls that would typically be incorporated to attain adequate noise reduction would include selection of quiet equipment, sound attenuators on fans, sound attenuator packages for cooling towers and emergency generators, acoustical screen walls, and equipment enclosures.

**FINDING:** As discussed in the Final EIR, operation of the project would result in similar ambient noise levels compared to those currently experienced by the nearest off-site sensitive receptors, which are within the local noise ordinance standards. The project would also comply with LRDP MM NOI-4, which requires that all mechanical equipment be selected and buildings be designed so that noise levels from the operation of the project do not exceed the noise ordinance limits. For these reasons, The Regents finds that with the implementation of LRDP MM NOI-4 that is included in and a part of the project, the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project would result in a less than significant impact related to long-term increases in ambient noise levels.

**3. Project Impacts that are Less Than Significant with Incorporation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measures and/or LRDP Mitigation Measures**

**i. Aesthetics**

*Impact AES-1: Implementation of the proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.*

The following LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure is included in and a part of the project as proposed:

LRDP MM AES-1: The University will install landscaping within the 40-foot landscape buffer adjacent to new specific projects that are approved. Installation would occur within one year of the development of the new projects.

**FINDING: As discussed in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that with the implementation of LRDP MM AES-1 that is included in and a part of the project, the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project would result in less than significant aesthetic impacts related to existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.**

*Impact AES-2: Implementation of the proposed project would create new sources of light and glare that could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.*

The following project-specific Mitigation Measures are included in and a part of the project as proposed:

AES-1: The use of security lighting during project construction shall be limited to only those locations on the construction site requiring illumination.

AES-2: All security lights shall be properly shielded and projected downwards during construction such that light is directed onto the project site only.

The following LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures are included in and a part of the project as proposed:

LRDP MM AES-2a: Design for specific projects shall provide for the use of textured non-reflective exterior surfaces and non-reflective glass.

LRDP MM AES-2b: Except as provided in LRDP Mitigation Measure AES-2c, all new outdoor lighting shall utilize directional lighting methods with shielded and cutoff type light fixtures to minimize glare and upward directed lighting.

LRDP MM AES-2c: 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 Facilities Planning, Design and Construction staff 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 MM AES-2d: The University will implement the use of the specific lighting design and equipment when older lighting fixtures and designs are replaced over time.

**FINDING:** As discussed in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that with the implementation of project specific MMs AES-1 and AES-2, along with LRDP MMs AES-2a through 2d that are included in and a part of the project, the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project would result in less than significant aesthetic impacts related to increased light and glare.

ii. *Biological Resources*

*Impact BIO-1: Implementation of the proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect on nesting birds, including Cooper's hawks or Purple martins.*

The following LRDP Mitigation Measure is included in and a part of the project as proposed:

LRDP MM BIO-2: If a construction project is proposed on the campus that would commence anytime during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species potentially nesting on the site (typically February through August in the project region), a pre-construction survey of the project vicinity for nesting birds shall be conducted.

This survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist (i.e., experienced with the nesting behavior of bird species of the region) two weeks prior to the commencement of construction activities. The intent of the survey would be to determine if active nests of special-status bird species or other species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code are present within the construction zone or within an area surrounding the construction zone as determined by the biologist. The survey area shall include all trees and shrubs in the construction zone and the surrounding area. The survey area shall also include a search of any buildings/structures to be demolished or near the construction zone, for nesting purple martins. The survey shall be timed such that the last survey is concluded no more than two weeks prior to initiation of construction. If ground disturbance activities are delayed following a survey, then an additional pre-construction survey shall be conducted such that no more than two weeks will have elapsed between the last survey and the commencement of ground disturbance activities.

If active nests are found in areas that could be directly affected or are within 500 feet of construction and would be subject to prolonged construction-related noise and/or vibration, a no-disturbance buffer zone shall be created around active nests during the breeding season or until a qualified biologist determines that all young have fledged. The size of the buffer zones and types of construction activities restricted within them will be determined through consultation with CDFG, taking into account factors such as the following:

- Noise and human disturbance levels at the construction site at the time of the survey and the noise and disturbance expected during the construction activity;
- Distance and amount of vegetation or other screening between the construction site and the nest; and
- Sensitivity of individual nesting species and behaviors of the nesting birds.

Limits of construction to avoid an active nest shall be established in the field with flagging, fencing, or another appropriate barrier and construction personnel shall be instructed on the sensitivity of nest areas. The biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those

periods when construction activities would occur near active nest areas of special status bird species to ensure that no impacts on these nests occur.

**FINDING:** The proposed project could potentially include construction commencing during the nesting season and, if so, a pre-construction nesting bird survey would be conducted in accordance with the requirements of LRDP Mitigation Measure BIO-2. With implementation of LRDP Mitigation Measure BIO-2, the potential impacts to Cooper's hawks and Purple martin would be less than significant. The Regents finds that the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project would result in a less than significant impact related to a substantial adverse effect on nesting birds, including Cooper's hawks or Purple martins.

### iii. *Cultural Resources*

*Impact CUL-1: Implementation of the proposed project could have a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource or result in disturbance to Native American remains.*

The following LRDP Mitigation Measures are included in and a part of the project as proposed:

LRDP MM CUL-2a: For all project sites, site-work contractor crews shall be required to attend an informal training session prior to the start of earth moving, regarding how to recognize artifacts and human remains. Prior to disturbing the soil, contractors shall be notified that they are required to watch for potential artifacts and to notify the University if any are found. In the event of a find, the University shall implement LRDP Mitigation Measures CUL-2b and CUL-2c below.

LRDP MM CUL-2b: If an archaeological resource is discovered during construction, all soil disturbing work within 100 feet of the find shall cease. The University shall contact a qualified archaeologist within 24 hours to inspect the site. If a resource within the project area of potential effect is determined to qualify as a unique archaeological resource (as defined by CEQA), the University shall devote adequate time and funding to salvage the material. Any archaeologically important artifacts recovered during monitoring shall be cleaned, catalogued, and analyzed, with the results presented in a report of finding that meets professional standards.

LRDP MM CUL-2c: 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 University shall contact a qualified archaeologist within 24 hours to determine whether the bone is human. If the qualified archaeologist determines the bone is human, or if a qualified archaeologist is not present, the University will notify the County Coroner of the find before additional disturbance occurs. Consistent with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(b), which prohibits disturbance of human remains uncovered by excavation until the Coroner has made a finding relative to PRC Section 5097 procedures, the University will ensure that 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 University will comply with the provisions of PRC Section 5097.98 regarding identification and involvement of the Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD).

If human remains cannot be left in place, the University 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 University 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 University shall ensure that human remains and associated artifact recovered from campus projects are repatriated to the appropriate local tribal group if requested.

**FINDING: The proposed project could potentially encounter archaeological resources during implementation of the proposed project, and the resources could be adversely affected. The impact is considered potentially significant. Implementation of mitigation in accordance with the requirements of LRDP MMs CUL-2a (training for construction workers conducting earth moving); CUL-2b (cessation of work and evaluation if resources are discovered); CUL-2c (proper archaeologist and coroner follow-up for any suspected human bone discovery) would ensure that a unique archaeological resource is not inadvertently destroyed and Native American remains, if encountered, are handled maintaining appropriate dignity, and the impact would be reduced to a less than significant level. The Regents finds that the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project would result in a less than significant impact related to a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource or result in disturbance to Native American remains.**

*Impact CUL-2: Implementation of the proposed project could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.*

The following LRDP Mitigation Measures are included in and a part of the project as proposed:

LRDP MM CUL-3a: As a first step during the project’s environmental review, the University shall determine whether the proposed project is in the portion of the campus where human remains associated with the former burial ground could likely be encountered. If the project site is in or near that area, the University will retain a qualified archaeologist to review the project information and as necessary develop and implement a subsurface testing program to check for human remains. If no human remains are encountered, the project may proceed to construction.

LRDP MM CUL-3b: In the event that human remains are encountered during subsurface testing, the area of the project site will be excavated under the supervision of the archaeologist and all human remains and associated artifacts will be removed from the site and examined for data. After the lab work, all recovered human remains and associated artifacts will be placed in caskets and buried in a single mass grave at a local cemetery.

LRDP MM CUL-3c: Implement LRDP MM CUL-2a.

LRDP MM CUL-3d: Implement LRDP MM CUL-2c.

**FINDING:** The proposed project could potentially encounter historic human remains during ground-disturbing activities, especially in the northern portion of the campus where a burial ground associated with the Sacramento County Hospital was located. The impact on human remains would be potentially significant. However, implementation of LRDP MMs CUL-3a through CUL-3d would ensure that any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, are handled with appropriate dignity. With the implementation of LRDP MMs CUL-3a through CUL-3d, the potential impact to human remains would be reduced to a less than significant level. The Regents finds that the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project would result in a less than significant impact related to the disturbance of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

iv. *Geology and Soils*

*Impact GEO-1: Implementation of the proposed project could result in exposure of people or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving liquefaction.*

The following LRDP Mitigation Measure is included in and a part of the project as proposed:

LRDP MM GEO-1: A site-specific, design-level geotechnical investigation shall be conducted during the design phase of each building project under the 2010 LRDP. This investigation shall be conducted by a licensed geotechnical engineer and include a seismic evaluation of ground acceleration under the design event as well as relevant soil conditions at the site. Geotechnical recommendations shall subsequently be incorporated into the foundation and building design.

**FINDING:** With preparation of a site-specific geotechnical investigation, included in and a part of the project as LRDP MM GEO-1, The Regents finds that the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project would result in a less than significant impact related to exposing people or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving liquefaction.

v. *Traffic*

*Impact TRA-1: Implementation of the proposed project could contribute to sub-standard intersection operations.*

The following project specific Mitigation Measure is included in and a part of the project as proposed:

TRA-1: The University shall require the prime contractor to prepare and implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan that will include, but will not necessarily be limited to, the following elements:

- Identify proposed truck routes to be used; no construction traffic is to be permitted on V Street.
- Specify construction hours, including limits on the number of truck trips during the a.m. and p.m. peak traffic periods (7:00 – 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.), if conditions demonstrate the need.

- Include a parking management plan for ensuring that construction worker parking results in minimal disruption to surrounding uses.
- Include a public information and signage plan to inform patients, visitors and staff of the planned construction activities, roadway changes/closures, and parking changes.
- Store construction materials only in designated areas that minimize impacts to nearby roadways.
- Use of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) certified flag persons for any temporary lane closures to minimize impacts to traffic flow, and to ensure safe access into and out of the project site(s).
- Develop circulation and detour plans to minimize impacts to local street impacts from construction activity on nearby major arterials. This may include the use of signing and flagging to guide vehicles through and/or around the construction zone.
- Limit the number of lane closures during peak hours to the extent possible.
- Install traffic control devices as specified in the California Department of Transportation Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones.
- Develop and implement access plans for potentially impacted local services such as police and fire stations, transit stations, hospitals, schools and parks. The access plans should be developed with the facility owner or administrator. To minimize disruption of emergency vehicle access, affected jurisdictions should be asked to identify detours for emergency vehicles, which will then be posted by the contractor.
- Coordinate with local transit agencies for temporary relocation of routes or bus stops in works zones, as necessary.
- Include coordination with other projects under construction in the immediate vicinity, so an integrated approach to construction-related traffic can be developed.

The following LRDP Mitigation Measures are included in and a part of the project as proposed:

LRDP MM TRA-1a: Travel Demand Management. To reduce on- and off-Campus vehicle trips and resulting impacts, the University will enhance its Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program. TDM strategies will include measures to increase transit and shuttle use, encourage alternative transportation modes including bicycle transportation, implement parking policies that reduce demand, and other mechanisms that reduce vehicle trips to and from the Campus. The University will work to achieve at least a 3% improvement in the mode split of daytime staff from the current 88% SOV/12% other modes. Trip reduction targets for students will be higher with approximately 15 to 20% traveling by other modes. The University shall monitor the performance of Campus TDM strategies through annual surveys.

LRDP MM TRA-1b: Transit Enhancement. To enhance transit systems serving the Campus, the University will work cooperatively with Sacramento Regional Transit, and other local agencies to coordinate service routes with existing and proposed shuttle and transit programs.

LRDP MM TRA-1c: Sustainability and Monitoring. The University shall review individual projects proposed under the 2010 LRDP for consistency with UC sustainable transportation policy and UC Davis Sacramento campus TDM strategies to ensure that bicycle and pedestrian improvements, alternative fuel infrastructure, transit stops, and other project features that promote alternative transportation are incorporated into each project to the extent feasible.

LRDP MM TRA-1d: Campus Traffic Impact Monitoring. The University will conduct traffic counts at key gateway locations on the Campus every five years to determine the amount of traffic generated by the Campus.

**FINDING: As discussed in the Final EIR, the project would not result in substandard intersection operations during operations but could result in sub-standard intersection operations during construction. This impact would be reduced to a less than significant level by implementation of project specific MM TRA-1. LRDP MMs TRA-1a through 1d are also included in and a part of the project. Therefore, The Regents finds that the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project would result in less than significant traffic impacts related to sub-standard intersection operations during either construction or operations.**

#### ***4. Project Impacts that are Significant and Unavoidable with Incorporation of Project-Specific and LRDP Mitigation Measures***

Where a public agency identifies significant environmental effects of a project that cannot feasibly be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the agency is nevertheless permitted to approve the project if it finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment. This written finding pertaining to the significant and unavoidable impacts of the project, known as a “Statement of Overriding Considerations,” is found in Section III, below.

The Final EIR identifies the following significant unavoidable adverse impact associated with the approval of the project. For a detailed description of this impact and mitigation measures, please see appropriate references in the Final EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

##### ***i. Noise***

*Impact NOI-1: Construction of the proposed project would expose existing off-site and on-site receptors to elevated noise levels.*

The following project specific Mitigation Measure is included in and a part of the project as proposed:

NOI-1: For each sequence of the North Addition Office Building construction and the North/South Wing demolition, the following actions will be completed.

- a) The Campus will conduct noise reduction analysis for each sequence of the proposed project. Each sequence will be evaluated once equipment details

and exact field conditions for that sequence are known in order to forecast whether the expected exterior noise levels will be below 70 dB(A) during the daytime at the affected sensitive receptors.

- b) In addition to LRDP MM NOI-1, if the noise reduction analysis completed per item (a) above reveals impacts above the 70 dB(A) threshold, the Campus will modify construction methods to reduce noise impacts to the greatest extent feasible, taking into account cost and sequencing constraints. The Campus will utilize the results of the noise reduction analysis to consider alternative construction/demolition techniques, revised equipment usage dates, specific placement of noise reduction barriers, and alternative equipment to reduce noise.
- c) Utilizing LRDP EIR noise measurement site LT-1 as a long-term noise monitoring site, the Campus will monitor noise levels throughout the project period to evaluate the effectiveness of LRDP MM NOI-1 and items (a) and (b) above. The monitoring effort will relay to project managers any instances where exterior noise levels at the project boundary exceed 70 dB(A) during the daytime. This data shall be used to evaluate the effectiveness of items (a) and (b), so that actual field conditions produced by the proposed project are compared to the analysis results in item (a). If the analysis results differ from the actual field conditions, project managers shall verify that the items prescribed as a result of item (b) have been properly implemented and adjust equipment usage or noise barriers to reduce noise levels to the greatest extent.
- d) If item (c) indicates a potential phase that will exceed the 70 dB(A) daytime threshold, such phases shall be limited to the hours of 8:30 AM to 3:30 PM.
- e) The Campus will notify nearby residents of expected periods with noise that could exceed the 70 dB(A) threshold. Based on the noise reduction analysis conducted above in item (b), nearby residents will be notified of the specific days when noise levels are expected to exceed the 70 dB(A) threshold.

The following LRDP Mitigation Measures are included in and a part of the project as proposed:

LRDP MM NOI-1: The following mitigation measures are proposed to reduce noise generated by demolition and construction activities:

- Erect temporary noise control blanket barriers in a manner to shield adjacent off-campus residences and on-campus occupied facilities at the perimeter of construction staging areas, at the perimeter of ground clearing, excavation, or demolition sites, and at elevated construction sites (i.e., multistory buildings). When feasible, barriers will be erected at or near the work site itself to provide the most noise attenuation.
- Where construction is adjacent to on-site or off-site sensitive receptors, construct a noise barrier 8 to 10 feet in height at the

project site perimeter that will break the line-of-sight between construction equipment and noise receptors, where feasible.

- Limit significant noise-generating construction activities, including truck traffic coming to and from the site for any purpose, to the hours of 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM Monday through Saturday, and 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM on Sundays and Holidays.
- Properly muffle and maintain all construction equipment powered by internal combustion engines.
- Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.
- Locate all stationary noise-generating construction equipment, such as air compressors and cranes, as far as practical from existing nearby residences and other noise-sensitive land uses. Acoustically shield such equipment.
- Select quiet construction equipment, particularly air compressors, whenever possible. (Fit motorized equipment with proper mufflers in good working order).
- Minimize construction traffic along V Street.

The Government and Community Relations office will be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The office would determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and would require that reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem be implemented. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the office at the construction site and include it in the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule.

**FINDING: The Regents finds that implementation of the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project would expose existing off-site and on-site receptors to elevated noise levels. Mitigation Measure NOI-1 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the project, as well as LRDP MM NOI-1. Implementation of these mitigation measures will reduce this impact, but not to a level of insignificance; therefore, implementation of the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement may result in an impact that is significant and unavoidable. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this significant and unavoidable environmental impact of the project, as explained in the accompanying statement of overriding considerations.**

### **C. ALTERNATIVES**

Section 5.0 of the Draft EIR evaluated a range of reasonable alternatives to the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project. In compliance with CEQA and CEQA Guidelines, the alternatives analysis included an analysis of a No Project Alternative and identified the environmentally superior alternative. The analysis examined the feasibility of each alternative, the environmental impacts of each alternative, and the ability of each alternative to meet the project objectives identified in Section 3.0 of the Draft EIR.

The Regents certify that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement alternatives provided in the Final EIR and the administrative record, and finds that all the alternatives are “infeasible” as that term is defined by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines for the reasons set forth below.

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

The Regents finds that the objectives for Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement, a component of implementing the 2010 LRDP are as described in Section 3.0, Project Description of the Draft EIR. The overall purpose of the 2010 LRDP is to provide a physical framework to support the goals of the campus’s UC Davis Health System Strategic Plan. The fundamental goal of the UC Davis Sacramento Campus 2010 LRDP is to carefully continue the growth of this major medical facility. This goal is reflective not only of UC Davis’s desire to excel and grow as a top-tier research and academic university but also the University of California’s broader mission of teaching, research, and public service excellence.

The basic objectives of the 2010 LRDP are as follows:

- The UC Davis Health System serves approximately 6.1 million residents in 33 counties encompassing 65,000 square miles in Northern and Central California. The population of the 33-county service area is projected to grow to 8.1 million by 2025. Additional inpatient and outpatient capacity are needed to meet community health care needs as the population in the service area grows. Furthermore, in view of the growing and aging regional population, there is a need for more health care providers, including doctors and nurses, in this portion of California and throughout the state.
- In addition, to continue to support its teaching and research missions, the UC Davis Health System Strategic Plan identifies focus areas for research, including cancer, neuroscience, infectious disease, and vascular disease, and identifies goals for successful program implementation.
- Additionally, some of the UC Davis Health System research programs and functions are located off site, which hinders collaboration and intellectual exchange. Finally, some existing buildings require replacement and as other buildings age, those will require replacement.
- Physical development on the Sacramento campus is needed to address all of these needs identified above. The proposed 2010 LRDP would continue the campus’ planning tradition of identifying general types and locations of campus development and land uses to support new research and educational initiatives, and ongoing development and expansion of the clinical enterprise. The underlying objective for the 2010 LRDP is to create a framework that helps enhance the quality of the Sacramento campus environment while providing the flexibility to support program expansion over the next 15 years to address the needs identified above.

The proposed Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project, an element of campus redevelopment under the 2010 LRDP, would result in the demolition of two seismically deficient buildings, the construction of a new state-of-the-art medical office building, the provision of two

new landscaped plazas, and affiliated vehicular and pedestrian circulation improvements. The specific objectives of the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement are to:

- Provide replacement space for offices and support functions in the seismically deficient North/South Wing.
- Promote synergy and consolidate departments focused on enhancing quality and the patient experience.
- Respect the residential neighborhood to the north.
- Foster highest and best use of space adjacent to the hospital.
- Provide modest amount of growth space for academic offices.
- Replace the hospital command center displaced by the Tower 1 renovation project.
- Achieve UC sustainability goals for energy performance.
- Create high quality office environment at reasonable cost.
- Provide office space as non-OSHPD space separate from hospital building.
- Complement the aesthetic and operational aspects of the existing hospital buildings.
- Create adjacent outdoor plaza/garden space.

## ***2. Alternatives Not Evaluated in Detail***

The Final EIR considered the following three alternatives for the project but did not evaluate them in detail because they did not meet project objectives or were found to be infeasible for technical, financial, or social reasons.

### **i. Reinforce and Renovate Existing Housestaff Building and Existing Hospital Space**

This alternative would seek to seismically reinforce and renovate the Housestaff Building and the North/South Wing of the Main Hospital on the University of California, Davis Medical Center (Sacramento campus). Under this alternative, the proposed North Office Addition Building would not be constructed. Instead, the following would need to occur to implement this alternative:

- An alternative space near the Main Hospital complex would need to be identified and/or developed to allow for the temporary relocation and housing of programs.
- Once programs are temporarily relocated, renovations to the North/South Wing would commence.
- Programs would then be relocated back into the structure.

While this alternative would meet space program goals, this strategy would not be able to meet the schedule mandated by the State of California Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD) that requires that the retrofit be completed by 2020 to address seismic safety. Second, a renovation project would add significant financial costs because of the phasing and coordination required to relocate the programs two times. Third, this alternative would cost more than the total cost to construct equivalent new space. The North/South Hospital Wing was expanded in the 1950's and the original seismically deficient, three-story, unreinforced-masonry 1928 structure serves as the core of the building. Retrofitting the 1928 part of the North/South Hospital Wing structure to meet seismic requirements would be extremely time consuming and is not cost effective. Excluding the logistics and phasing required to facilitate seismic renovations, the cost of the renovation itself is estimated at \$221.94 million, far greater than the estimated cost of \$87.5 million to construct a new building. Reasons for such a costly renovation include both the age of the building and the specifics of construction. The renovation of the Housestaff Building would also not be cost effective. Estimates for a seismic retrofit of the Housestaff Building indicated that a total project cost would be approximately twice the cost of constructing new space. Based on UC Davis objectives for long-term building management, efficient use of available public funds, and provision of building spaces that meet accessibility needs, a seismic retrofit for the Housestaff Building is impractical under current conditions. More specifically, a 2008 study indicated a construction cost of approximately \$7 million; conservatively estimating cost escalation, this would be around \$9.2 million construction in 2015, further escalating to \$10-\$11 million in 2018. The total project cost would be around \$16-\$17 million, including anticipated soft costs, such as design and project management. This equates to an \$850/GSF cost range, which is substantially higher than the cost of new construction. For all of the above reasons, this alternative was not carried forth for detailed evaluation.

## **ii. Alternate Off-Campus Location**

This alternative would involve identifying and securing long-term lease space near the Main Hospital to house programs currently within the seismically deficient North/South Wing and the Housestaff Building. The Main Hospital complex is bordered primarily by residential homes and small commercial structures currently occupied by UCDHS and non-UCDHS tenants; these structures generally do not have enough contiguous space to satisfy all of the project's program requirements. Moreover, one of the programs being relocated from the North/South Wing is the Main Hospital's primary administration in charge of operations. Managing the Main Hospital from a location off-campus would add significant operational costs from a travel and logistics standpoint, and would also lower the standard of patient care. For example, some programs (especially Trauma) need to be within a fifteen-minute walking distance of the surgery rooms within the Main Hospital complex. There is no vacant leasable space that is large enough to satisfy program requirements within a reasonable radius of the Main Hospital.

In order to provide a comprehensive analysis, one lease was analyzed for cost per square foot metrics. However, it is important to note that this lease cannot satisfy the distance or square footage requirements for the programs being relocated out of the North/South Wing, but is used for illustrative purposes. For a ten-year lease that would be built-to-suit by a developer, the total cost (turn-key) is currently estimated at \$87.5 million. While this is approximately the estimated total cost for new University construction, the issue of long-term lease costs would still remain, as many programs being relocated out of the North/South Wing are key hospital administrative departments that require permanent space. This operational reality renders this alternative to be physically

impossible in the short term and financially disadvantageous in the long term. For all of the above reasons, this alternative was not carried forth for detailed evaluation.

### iii. Alternate Location on Campus

This alternative would involve constructing the proposed North Addition Office Building at another location on the campus, while still demolishing the North/South Wing and the Housestaff Building. UCDHS evaluated other potential locations on the campus but concluded that many of the key objectives of the proposed project would not be attained if the proposed office building were not placed immediately adjacent to the Main Hospital. As noted above, some of the key project objectives are to:

- Promote synergy and consolidate departments focused on enhancing quality and the patient experience.
- Foster highest and best use of space adjacent to the hospital.
- Replace the hospital command center displaced by the Tower 1 renovation project.
- Provide office space as non-OSHPD space separate from hospital building.
- Complement the aesthetic and operational aspects of the existing hospital buildings.
- Create high quality office environment at reasonable cost.

For these reasons, this alternative was not carried forth for detailed evaluation.

### 3. *Alternatives to the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project*

The EIR evaluated two alternatives to the proposed Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project: Alternative 1: No Project Alternative; and Alternative 2: Reduced Building Size Alternative.

#### i. **Alternative 1: No Project Alternative**

The CEQA Guidelines require a consideration of the No Project Alternative. Under the No Project Alternative, a new office building to house programs being relocated out of the Housestaff Building and the North/South Wing of the Main Hospital would not be constructed. However, due to seismic safety concerns and meet the OSHPD mandate, programs located in the two buildings would need to be relocated into other existing building space. A single leased space that satisfies the distance or square footage requirements for the programs being relocated out of the North/South Wing is not available. Therefore, under the No Project Alternative, the various relocated programs would move into existing on-campus space and off-campus leased space. The programs would therefore be dispersed and would not have the benefit that would result from provision of the space necessary for consolidation of the programs, as well as convenient access to the Main Hospital.

**FINDING: The Regents finds that the No Project Alternative is infeasible and is hereby rejected. The No Project Alternative is inferior to the project as proposed because, while the No Project Alternative would avoid the environmental impacts associated with proposed**

project, it would not meet the basic project objectives of improving seismic safety and providing necessary building space.

**ii. Alternative 2: Reduced Building Size**

This alternative would reduce the size of the proposed North Addition Office Building by two floors (approximately 43,500 GSF), in comparison with the proposed project's approximately 130,000 GSF, six-story building. This reduction in building space in the new building would require that the UCDHS either construct a smaller building in another location on the campus or relocate the unhoused programs into existing on-campus space (if available) and/or secure leased space in existing buildings near the campus. No other changes to the proposed project are included in this alternative; the demolition of the Housestaff Building and the North/South Hospital Wing, along with the construction of the new façade and the two new pedestrian plaza areas would remain the same as under the proposed project. As such, access, circulation, and landscape features (including the landscape buffer on the northern edge of the campus) would be generally similar to those under the proposed project.

**FINDING: The Regents finds that the Reduced Building Size Alternative is infeasible and is hereby rejected. This alternative would partially achieve the basic objectives of the proposed project which are to provide replacement space for offices and support functions in the seismically deficient North/South Hospital Wing, at a location proximate to the Main Hospital. However, the 33 percent reduction in the building space under this alternative would reduce the ability of this alternative to provide all the necessary space. The remaining needed space would have to be provided either in a smaller new building elsewhere on the campus or in existing on- or off-campus space. As a result, this alternative would not meet several key objectives of the proposed project, which are to promote synergy and consolidate departments with a focus on enhancing the quality of care and the patient experience; foster highest and best use of space adjacent to the Main Hospital; provide a modest amount of growth space for academic offices; replace the hospital command center displaced by the Tower 1 renovation project; and create a high quality office environment at reasonable cost.**

**iii. Other Proposed Alternatives**

**FINDING: The Regents further finds that with respect to alternatives that were suggested in comments on the Draft EIR, the Responses to Comments explain that the suggested alternatives are infeasible and thus are not recommended for further study or adoption. The Regents hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the reasons stated in the Responses to Comments as the grounds for finding these suggested alternatives to be infeasible.**

***4. Environmentally Superior Alternative***

**FINDING: The Regents finds that while the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative because it would avoid the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires that if the environmentally superior alternative is the no project alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Therefore, the environmentally superior alternative, excepting the No Project Alternative, is the Reduced**

**Building Space Alternative.** The Reduced Building Space Alternative would incrementally reduce development, thereby reducing the construction noise impact compared to the proposed project. Because neither the No Project Alternative nor the Reduced Building Space Alternative meet the project objectives, however, The Regents would be required to develop alternative solutions to meet the required seismic safety standards and the need for office space proximate to the Main Hospital to accommodate medical and support staff, which would result in impacts that cannot be known at this time. Additionally, as explained above, The Regents finds that the Reduced Building Space Alternative is infeasible because it would fail to meet several of the fundamental objectives of the project.

## **II. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

### **A. Impacts that Remain Significant**

As discussed above, The Regents has found that the following impact of the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project remains significant, either in whole or in part, following adoption and implementation of the mitigation measures described in the Final EIR:

<b>Environmental Impact Area</b>	<b>Impact</b>
Noise – Impact NOI-1	Construction of the proposed project would expose existing off-site and on-site receptors to elevated noise levels.

### **B. 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 a level of insignificance, 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 2010 LRDP. The benefits of the project include the following:

1) The UC Davis Health System serves approximately 6.1 million residents in 33 counties encompassing 65,000 square miles in Northern and Central California. The population of the 33-county service area is projected to grow to 8.1 million by 2025. Additional inpatient and outpatient capacity are needed to meet community health care needs as the population in the service area grows. Furthermore, in view of the growing and aging regional population, there is a need for more health care providers, including doctors and nurses, in this portion of California and throughout the state. The UC Davis Health System provides a number of unique services in terms of treatment and expertise and the need for those unique services is expected to grow as the regional population increases.

As part of implementing the 2010 LRDP, the proposed Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project will promote synergy and consolidate departments focused on enhancing the

quality of the patient experience, improve the efficiency and sustainability of the UC Davis Sacramento Campus and meet the physical development needs for a growing population.

2) The Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project will strengthen the campus physical appearance through the implementation of formal open space areas that will serve as pedestrian corridors and will enhance the appeal of the campus as a top-tier medical institution. The improved physical appearance of the campus will enhance recruiting efforts for new employees and will provide a more attractive and comforting environment for patients and visitors.

3) Implementation of the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project, as a component of the 2010 LRDP, will help UC Davis address seismic and other code-related deficiencies in aging North/South Hospital Wing, comply with state seismic mandates, and maintain hospital licensure.

4) The development of the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project, as a component of the 2010 LRDP, will enable UC Davis to help the University of California fulfill its obligation to improve and provide state of the art facilities for health care and health-care related support facilities, as well as improved facilities for higher education for the residents of the State of California.

**Considering all factors, The Regents finds that there are specific economic, legal, social, technological and other considerations associated with the project that outweigh the project's one significant and unavoidable environmental effect, and that significant and unavoidable adverse effect is therefore considered acceptable.**

### **III. INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE**

These findings incorporate by reference in their entirety the text of the EIR prepared specifically for this project, the 2010 LRDP, the 2010 LRDP Final EIR, and the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations and Mitigation Monitoring Program adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2010 LRDP. Without limitation, this incorporation is intended to elaborate on the scope and nature of the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project, potential environmental impacts that could result from the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project, related mitigation measures, and the basis for determining the significance of the impacts of the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project.

### **IV. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

1. When making findings, a lead agency must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project that it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The Regents hereby adopts the **Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program** for the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project, as set forth in **Section 2.0 of the Final EIR**. To the extent this project incorporates relevant 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation measures previously adopted by The Regents, implementation of these mitigation measures by this project will be monitored pursuant to the 2010

LRDP EIR monitoring program previously adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2010 LRDP EIR.

2. In the 2010 LRDP EIR, UC Davis identified some mitigation measures which would further reduce environmental impacts determined to be less than significant even without mitigation. While there is no requirement to mitigate insignificant environmental impacts, mitigation measures further reducing the less-than-significant impacts are included in the approval of the project to further enhance environmental quality, as detailed above. The mitigation monitoring program adopted by The Regents (see paragraph 1, above) will monitor mitigation measures designed to reduce or eliminate significant impacts, as well as those mitigation measures designed to reduce environmental impacts which were initially determined to be less than significant.

## **V. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

The record of proceedings upon which The Regents bases these findings consists of all the documents and evidence relied upon by UC Davis in preparing the 2010 LRDP, the 2010 LRDP EIR and the project-specific EIR for the Hospital Seismic Demolition and Office Replacement project. The custodian of the record of proceedings is: UC Davis, Office of Facilities, Design and Construction, Facilities Support Services Building, 4800 Second Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95817.

## **VI. SUMMARY**

1. Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, the Regents has made one or more of the following Findings with respect to the significant environmental effects of the project 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 that are wholly or partially within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency 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 in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section II.B., above.

## **VII. APPROVALS**

The Regents hereby takes the following actions:

- A. The Regents certifies the Final EIR for the project, as described in Section I., above.
- B. The Regents hereby adopts, incorporates into the project, and makes a condition of project approval, all project elements, project-specific mitigation measures, and relevant LRDP mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR, as discussed in the Findings, Section I, above.
- C. The Regents makes the statement of overriding considerations, above, with respect to the project's significant and unavoidable impact on noise, and reaffirms the 2010 LRDP EIR's statement of overriding considerations with respect to significant and unavoidable impacts of 2010 LRDP development to which this project may incrementally contribute.
- D. The Regents hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and Findings in their entirety as set forth above.
- E. Having certified the Final EIR, independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR, conditioned the project as described above, and adopted the Findings, The Regents hereby approves the design of the North Addition Office Building project at the UC Davis Sacramento campus.