

ADDENDUM #1 to the
2008-2009 CENTRAL CAMPUS MAJOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS MITIGATED
NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE CLASSROOM AND RECITAL HALL PROJECT
MAY, 2014

The University of California (“University”) adopted the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration in association with approval of the design for the Chilled Water Phase 7 Project in 2009. The Projects analyzed in the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration were the proposed construction of four new campus facilities at UC Davis. The 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 2008112090) was submitted to the Office of Planning and Research’s State Clearinghouse in compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

After design approval and certification of the Chilled Water Phase 7 Project in 2009, the University proceeded with two of the additional projects evaluated in the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. Further discretionary approval is now required to approve the design of the Classroom and Recital Hall Project. This Addendum #1 to the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared in compliance with CEQA Guidelines sections 15162 and 15164 to examine the potential environmental impacts of the Project.

Project Evaluated in the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Tiered Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

The Project is one of four projects evaluated in the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration and is the fourth and final of the four projects proposed for approval and construction. The four projects described and evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration are summarized below.

Chilled Water Phase 7. The Chilled Water Phase 7 development was approved in February 2009 and is now constructed. The project extended underground chilled water and steam utilities through the core campus to provide increased distribution for the chilled water system. The Chilled Water Phase 7 included approximately 3,500 linear feet of chilled water and steam piping and the construction process utilized corridor approximately 30 feet in width.

Segundo Services Center. The Segundo Services Center was approved in 2009. The Segundo Services Center development constructed a three-story building west of the previous Segundo Dining commons. The development is approximately 35,400 gross square feet (gsf) and includes a new mechanical room for steam generation to serve the proposed Segundo Services Center building and for the adjacent existing Segundo dormitory buildings.

Student Community Center. The Student Community Center was approved in 2009 on a two acre site to provide space for student support functions such as food service, lounges, studying space, and counseling space. The Center constructed an approximately 17,000 gsf facility for several student service programs that focus on student life, campus diversity, and campus community development.

Classroom and Recital Building. The Music Instruction and Recital Building was evaluated in the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration and has been subsequently renamed the Classroom and Recital Hall. The Classroom and Recital Hall Project proposes an approximately 17,000 gross square foot (gsf) building on the core campus adjacent to the existing Music Building. As proposed, the Project would now provide approximately 1,000 gsf less than the Project evaluated in the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration. The centerpiece of the facility is the approximately 400 seat lecture and recital hall, designed to accommodate large music and general lecture classes as well as instrumental and choral performances.

The instructional program in music, which integrates theoretical study, technical competence to perform, and the actual experience of performance, is currently constrained by the lack of an appropriate performance and music lecture space. This Project will deliver specialized space to meet the needs associated with this type of instruction. The Classroom and Recital Hall will also provide instructional studios, practice rooms, faculty offices, and administrative offices to replace inadequate spaces currently used by the music program that are dispersed to multiple locations. The Project allows for consolidation of the music program and addresses the program's need for space designed to provide appropriate acoustical quality and instructional space.

Preparation of a CEQA Addendum

Section 15164(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states that a lead agency "shall prepare and an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described CEQA Guidelines section 15162 have occurred. CEQA Guidelines section 15162, state that no additional environmental review shall be prepared for a project unless the public agency with the next discretionary approval determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was

certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

- (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
- (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
- (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
- (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

If none of the conditions described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, above, requires the preparation of a subsequent EIR, the University shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, addendum or no further documentation. This Addendum #1 has been prepared in compliance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164 to examine the potential environmental impacts of the Project. The proposed Project addressed in this Addendum does not trigger any of the conditions necessitating preparation of a subsequent environmental review; therefore, as documented in this addendum, only minor additions to the Final IS/MND are necessary to evaluate the Project.

The legal criteria for an Addendum are present here. None of the conditions or circumstances that would require preparation of subsequent or supplemental environmental review pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 exists in connection with the Project. No substantial changes have been proposed as part of the Project as compared to the descriptions and evaluations of the development proposed in the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration. In addition, there is no new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the LRDP EIR was certified showing that new or more severe environmental impacts not addressed in those documents would occur, that mitigation measures or alternatives found infeasible would in fact be feasible, or that different mitigation measures or alternatives from those analyzed would substantially reduce one or more significant impacts.

CEQA Guideline 15162 Analysis

The following section assesses the proposed Project elements in relation to the CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 standards set forth above. In addition, in 2010, the topic of greenhouse gas emissions was added to CEQA requirements. Accordingly, in addition to the resource topics analyzed in the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration, this addendum expands upon the original greenhouse gas emissions

analysis to consider whether the Project elements are within the Section 15162 standards related to creating new impacts, substantially increasing significant effects, or adopting potential mitigation measures.

D. Project-Specific Impacts

An analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the Project in relation to the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration demonstrates that pursuant to Section 15162 of the California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 3 (the “CEQA Guidelines”) and Section 21166 of the Public Resources Code (CEQA), no further environmental review is required because:

- (1) The project will not require major revisions to the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration, and will not result in new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.
- (2) There are no changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions of the previously adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration, and that no new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects will occur as a result of the project.
- (3) No new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted that shows any of the following:
 - a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration.
 - b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration.
 - c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Accordingly, as documented below, the University has determined that the Project will not result in any new significant environmental effects, or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Major revisions to the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration are not required. There is no new information or changed circumstances to indicate that the Project would have one or more significant effects not discussed in the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration, or that significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than previously shown or that there are feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that have not been adopted.

The analysis indicates that the Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Traffic, Circulation and Parking, and Utilities effects will remain as determined in the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration. For this addendum, the University has completed additional modeling and analysis of greenhouse gas emissions. The adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration considered those emissions in the context of its air quality analysis and concluded that the Project's greenhouse gas emissions would be less than significant; this addendum confirms that determination. Further, the Project does not affect the mitigation measures and mitigation measures monitoring program adopted in connection with the approval of the 2003 LRDP and the adopted 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration, which are hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

1. Aesthetics

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on aesthetics are evaluated in Section 4.1 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. Section 7.1 of the adopted Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the specific effects of the proposed Project on aesthetics. The following specific impact categories were evaluated with respect to the proposed Project in the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects, as documented below. No revisions have been proposed to the Project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and no changed circumstance or new information is present. The minor revision of gsf from 18,000 to 17,000 would not change the appearance, function, occupancy, or location of the building. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for aesthetics, as discussed below. Additionally, in preparing this addendum, the University did not identify any new mitigation measures or project revisions that have become available since the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and that would further lessen the previously identified impacts.

a) Scenic Vistas (*Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*)

The 2003 LRDP EIR defined a scenic vista as an expansive view of a highly valued landscape from a publicly accessible viewpoint, and identified the only scenic vista on the UC Davis campus to be the view west across agricultural land to the Coast Range. The Mitigated Negative Declaration determined in Appendix A, Section 7.1.4(a) that the Classroom and Recital Hall would not affect views to the Coast Range because the Project components are within Central Campus areas that are surrounded by extensive building development and mature landscaping. In addition, views to the Coast Range do not exist from the Project site because buildings and landscaping block all long-distance views.

b and c) Scenic Resources (*Would the Project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*); or, **Visual Character** (*Would the Project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.1.4(b and c) that the Classroom and Recital Hall is not located near a state scenic highway and that the Project would not degrade the visual character of the campus by substantially degrading the valued elements of the campus' visual landscape, which are identified above in the background discussion and include specific treed areas, historic buildings, and open space areas.

d) Light and Glare (*Would the Project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*)

The adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.1.4(d) that the Classroom and Recital Hall would occur on developed areas that already include substantial night lighting. Because the Project involves in-fill development and demolition of existing buildings, the lighting for the proposed developments would not expand the current light and glare effects.

2. Agricultural Resources

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on agricultural resources are evaluated in Section 4.2 of the 2003 LRDP EIR and Section 7.2 of the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the specific effects of the Classroom and Recital Hall. The specific impact categories identified below were evaluated in relation to the Project in the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects. No revisions have been proposed to the Project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and no changed circumstance or new information is present. The minor revision of gsf from 18,000 gsf to 17,000 gsf would not change the appearance, function, occupancy, or location of the building and would not result in any new impacts or changes to agricultural resources impacts of the proposed Project. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for aesthetics, as discussed below. Additionally, in preparing this addendum, the University did not identify any new mitigation measures or Project revisions that have become available since the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and that would further lessen the previously identified impacts.

a) Conversion of Farmland (*Would the Project Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded in Appendix A, Section 7.2.4(a) that the Classroom and Recital Hall would be constructed on land designated as Urban and Built Up

Land on the FMMP mapping program and is a previously developed site. The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the building would not convert agricultural lands.

b) Williamson Act Contracts (*Would the Project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*)

Campus lands are state lands and are not eligible for Williamson Act agreements, nor are they subject to local zoning controls. The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded in Appendix A, Section 7.2.4(b) the Classroom and Recital Hall would have no effect on Williamson Act Contracts.

c) Other Changes to Result in Conversion of Farmland (*Would the Project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Classroom and Recital Hall would have no effect on agricultural resources because it would occur entirely within developed portions of the core campus at UC Davis and would have no relation to agricultural operations.

3. Air Quality

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on air quality are evaluated in Section 4.3 of the 2003 LRDP EIR and Section 7.3 of the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the specific effects of the Classroom and Recital Hall. The minor revision of gsf from 18,000 gsf to 17,000 gsf would not change the appearance, function, occupancy, or location of the building and would not result in any new impacts or changes to air quality impacts of the proposed Project.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Classroom and Recital Hall would not exceed the levels of significance of air quality impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant impacts that were not previously addressed. Mitigation measures 4.3-1 (a-c), 4.3-3 (a-c), 4.3-6, and 4.3-8 from the 2003 LRDP EIR were determined relevant to the Classroom and Recital Hall to reduce the significance of air quality impacts to the extent feasible. These mitigation measures are listed below and are hereby incorporated into the Project. The Mitigated Negative Declaration did not identify any new mitigation measures that would further reduce the impacts of the Classroom and Recital Hall. Additionally, in preparing this addendum, the University did not identify any new mitigation measures or Project revisions that have become available since the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and that would further lessen the previously identified impacts.

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures AIR QUALITY

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.

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
AIR QUALITY

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
AIR QUALITY

- 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.
- 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.
 - Limit the area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activity at any one time.
- 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.
- 4.3-6 Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.3-1(a-c).

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
AIR QUALITY

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

The following specific impact categories identified below were evaluated in relation to the Project in the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects.

a,b,c,d) Air Emissions (*Would the Project conflict with air quality planning or standards and would the Project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in a non-attainment pollutant or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.3.4(a,b,c, and d) that the Project could contribute to potentially cumulative significant impacts related to implementation of the adopted air quality plan, air quality standards, cumulative effects of air emissions, and exposure of sensitive receptors to emission. While the Project would contribute to the previously identified cumulative significant impact, the individual effects of the proposed Project would be less-than-significant. For all of these impacts, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR. Further, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that mitigation measures prescribed in the 2003 LRDP EIR would minimize this impact to the greatest extent feasible (4.3-1 (a-c), 4.3-6, and 4.3-8) and that no Project specific mitigation measures are available to further reduce the impact. This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project, there are no changed Project conditions or new information that would alter the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration. In addition, the existing regional air quality planning and local air quality regulations have not changed since the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration in February 2009.

No additional mitigation measures or Project revisions have been identified that would further lessen the previously identified impact since the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration. Therefore, the Mitigated Negative Declaration analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to adequately address this impact and no further environmental documentation is required.

e) Odors (*Would the Project create objectionable odors?*)

The 2003 LRDP EIR concluded that odor impacts associated with development under the 2003 LRDP would be less than significant. The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded in Appendix A, Section 7.3.4(e) that the Classroom and Recital Hall would not generate substantial

odors because the Project involves no cooking facilities or chemical fume hood vents that would be a source of odors. The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant odor impact. No revisions have been proposed to the Classroom and Recital Hall as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and no changed circumstance or new information is present. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

f) Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded in Appendix A, Section 7.3.4(f) that the Classroom and Recital Hall would result in greenhouse gas emissions from construction equipment and long-term operation. Although the Project would result in buildings that achieve a LEED Gold or higher rating and this effort would help to minimize operational emissions from the buildings, it would contribute to greenhouse gas emissions that are producing global climate change. The adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the proposed Project would have less-than-significant effect on greenhouse gas emissions because the proposed Project would not contradict the foreseeable options for greenhouse gas reductions. In addition, the existing statewide planning, regional air quality planning and local air quality regulations have not changed since the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration in February 2009. No revisions have been proposed to the Classroom and Recital Hall as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and no changed circumstance or new information is present. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

4. Biological Resources

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on biological resources are evaluated in Section 4.4 of the 2003 LRDP EIR and Section 7.4 of the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the specific effects of the Classroom and Recital Hall. The minor revision of gsf from 18,000 gsf to 17,000 gsf would not change the appearance, function, occupancy, or location of the building and would not result in any new impacts or changes to biological resources impacts of the proposed Project.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Classroom and Recital Hall would not exceed the levels of significance of biological resources impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant impacts that were not previously addressed. Mitigation measures 4.4-4 (a,b) and 4.4-5 from the 2003 LRDP EIR were determined relevant to the Classroom and Recital Hall to reduce the significance of biological resources impacts to the extent feasible. These mitigation measures are listed below and are hereby incorporated into the Project. Because the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that implementation of the below listed LRDP mitigation measures would reduce to a less than significant level any impacts of the Project on biological resources, no additional Project level mitigation measures were required. Additionally, in preparing this addendum, the University did not identify any new mitigation measures or Project revisions that have become available since

the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and that would further lessen the previously identified impacts.

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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 raptors, including 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.

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.

4.4-5 Mitigation 4.4-4(a) and (b) will be implemented, including pre-construction survey of trees on and

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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).

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 Foothill 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). This would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

The following specific impact categories were evaluated with respect to the Project in the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects, as documented below. The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. There are no changed project conditions or new information. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required, as discussed below.

a) Effect on Special-Status Species (*Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.4.4(a) that the Project could contribute to potentially significant impacts effects on special-status species. For these impacts, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR. Further, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that mitigation measures prescribed in the 2003 LRDP EIR (LRDP Mitigations 4.4-4(a)-(b) and 4.4-5) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

b,c) Riparian or Wetland Areas (*Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural*

community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.4.4(b,c) that the Project could have no impact on riparian or wetland areas. Accordingly, no mitigation measures were needed for this issue.

d) Movement of Fish or Wildlife *(Would the Project 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?)*

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.4.4(d) that the Project could have no impact on movement of fish or wildlife. Accordingly, no mitigation measures were needed for this issue.

e) Local Policies, Tree Protection *(Would the Project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?)*

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.4.4(e) that the Project could contribute to potentially significant impacts related tree protection. For this impact, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR. Further, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that a mitigation measure prescribed in the 2003 LRDP EIR (LRDP Mitigation 4.4-11) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

f) Conflict with Adopted HCP *(Would the Project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?)*

For the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.4.4(f) that the Project could have no impact on any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan. Accordingly, no mitigation measures were needed for this issue.

5. Cultural Resources

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on cultural resources are evaluated in Section 4.5 of the 2003 LRDP EIR and Section 7.5 of the Project Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the specific effects of the Classroom and Recital Hall. The minor revision of gsf from 18,000 gsf to 17,000 gsf would not change the appearance, function, occupancy, or location of the building and would not result in any new impacts or changes to cultural resources impacts of the proposed Project.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Classroom and Recital Hall would not exceed the levels of significance of cultural resources impacts previously addressed in the 2003

LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant impacts that were not previously addressed. Mitigation measures 4.5-1 (a-c), 4.5-2 (a,b), 4.5-3, 4.5-4 (a-d), and 4.5-5 from the 2003 LRDP EIR were determined relevant to the Classroom and Recital Hall to reduce the significance of cultural resources impacts. These mitigation measures are listed below and are hereby incorporated into the Project. With incorporation of these mitigation measures, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that no new Project-level mitigation measures were required, as discussed below. Additionally, in preparing this addendum, the University did not identify any new mitigation measures or Project revisions that have become available since the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and that would further lessen the previously identified impacts.

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

CULTURAL RESOURCES

- 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).
- 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

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
CULTURAL RESOURCES

- 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.
- 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 historic 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.
- 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

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
CULTURAL RESOURCES

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.

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.

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)
- (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).

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
CULTURAL RESOURCES

- 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.
- 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.
- 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 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 campus will comply with the provisions of PRC § 5097.98 regarding identification and involvement of the Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD).
- 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.
- 4.5-5 Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.5-1 through 4.5-4.
-

The following specific impact categories were evaluated with respect to the Project in the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects, as documented below. The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

a) Historic Resources (*Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.5.4(a) that the Project could have no impact on historic resources. Accordingly, no mitigation measures were needed for this issue.

b) Archaeological Resources (*Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.5.4(b) that the Project could contribute to potentially significant impacts related to disturbance of archaeological resources and cumulative effects to archaeological resources. For this impact, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR. Further, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that mitigation measures prescribed in the 2003 LRDP EIR would minimize this impact to the greatest extent feasible (LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(b), 4.5-2, 4.5-3, and 4.5-5) and would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

c) Paleontological Resources (*Would the Project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.5.4(c) that the Project could have no impact on unique paleontological or geological resources. Accordingly, no mitigation measures were needed for this issue.

d) Human Remains (*Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.5.4(d) that the Project could contribute to potentially significant impacts related to disturbance of human remains. For this impact, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR. Further, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that mitigation measures prescribed in the 2003 LRDP EIR would minimize this impact to the greatest extent feasible (LRDP Mitigation 4.5-4(a-d)) and would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

6. Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on geology and soils are evaluated in Section 4.6 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. Section 7.6 of the adopted Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the specific effects of the proposed Project on geology and soils. The following specific impact categories were evaluated with respect to the proposed Project in the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects, as discussed below. No revisions have been proposed to the Classroom and Recital Hall as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and no changed circumstance or new information is present that would alter the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration analysis. The minor revision of gsf from 18,000 gsf to 17,000 gsf would not change the appearance, function, occupancy, or location of the building and would not result in any new impacts or changes to geology, soils, and seismicity impacts of the proposed Project. Accordingly, as discussed below, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

a,i) Fault Rupture (*Would the Project expose people to effects from an earthquake fault?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.6.4(a,i) that the UC Davis campus and the surrounding area are not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and the closest known active fault rupture zones are over 30 miles away and therefore the Project is not subject to fault rupture.

a,ii and iii) Seismic Shaking (*Would the Project expose people to effects from strong seismic ground shaking?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration in Appendix A, Section 7.6.4(a,ii) found that the campus minimizes hazards associated with damage or destruction to buildings and other structures by reviewing and approving all draft building plans for compliance with the California Building Code (CBC) and by adhering to the University of California Seismic Safety Policy. The Mitigated Negative Declaration identified that the impact associated with risks due to seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

a,iv) Landslides (*Would the Project expose people to effects from landslides?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.6.4(a,iv) that the Project would result in no risk from landslides because the UC Davis campus and the surrounding area are characterized by flat topography and therefore are not subject to landslides.

b) Soil Erosion (*Would the Project result in Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration identified in Appendix A, Section 7.6.4(b) that the soil types that occur on the UC Davis campus, including the Project site, contain a high amount of silt and clay, and these soil types have minimal erosion hazard. The Mitigated Negative Declaration determined that soil erosion effects would be less than significant.

c) Unstable Geology (*Would the Project result in Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated in Appendix A, Section 7.6.4(c) the potential for liquefaction and soil subsidence and identified that the low likelihood of substantial liquefaction and subsidence on the campus would result in less than significant effects from the proposed Project.

d) Expansive Soil (*Would the Project result in Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?*)

The soils in several areas of the campus have high shrink/swell potential and could, on a site-specific basis, have the potential to create risk to life or property. Campus policy requires compliance with the California Building Code (CBC), which includes provisions for construction on expansive soils such as proper fill selection, moisture control, and compaction during construction. The Mitigated Negative Declaration determined in Appendix A, Section 7.6.4(d)

that this potential impact would be less than significant because the Project will comply with the CBC, which will ensure that this impact is less than significant.

e) Suitability for Septic Systems (*Would the Project result in Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?)*

The Mitigated Negative Declaration stated in Appendix A, Section 7.6.4(e) that no septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are included in the proposed Project, and there would be no impact.

7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded in Appendix A, Section 7.3.4(f) that the Classroom and Recital Hall would result in greenhouse gas emissions from construction equipment and long-term operation. Although the Project would result in a building that would achieve a LEED Gold or higher rating and this effort would help to minimize operational emissions from the buildings, the building would contribute to greenhouse gas emissions that are producing global climate change. The adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the proposed Project would have less-than-significant effect on greenhouse gas emissions because the proposed Project would not contradict the foreseeable options for greenhouse gas reductions. In an updated effort to forecast potential greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed Classroom and Recital Project, the campus utilized the CalEEMod computer model for greenhouse emissions from the Project. The updated emission modelling indicates that the potential emissions from the Project would continue to be less-than-significant. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on hazards and hazardous materials are evaluated in Section 4.7 of the 2003 LRDP EIR and Section 7.7 of the Project Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the specific effects of the Classroom and Recital Hall. The minor revision of gsf from 18,000 gsf to 17,000 gsf would not change the appearance, function, occupancy, or location of the building and would not result in any new impacts or changes to hazards and hazardous materials impacts of the proposed Project.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Classroom and Recital Hall would not exceed the levels of significance of hazards and hazardous materials impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant impacts that were not previously addressed. Mitigation measures 4.7-1, 4.7-2 (a,b), 4.7-8, 4.7-9, 4.7-12, 4.7-13,

and 4.7-17 from the 2003 LRDP EIR were determined relevant to the Classroom and Recital Hall to reduce the significance of hazards and hazardous materials impacts. These mitigation measures are listed below and are hereby incorporated into the Project. With incorporation of the LRDP mitigation measures identified below, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that no new Project-level mitigation measures were required, as discussed below. .

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- 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.
 - 4.7-2(a) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.7-1.
 - 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.
 - 4.7-8 The campus shall continue to require that packaging of chemicals to be transported on public roads conform with all legal requirements.
 - 4.7-9 Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.7-1 through 4.7-8.
 - 4.7-12 The campus shall perform due diligence assessments of all sites where ground-disturbing construction is proposed.
 - 4.7-13 The campus shall survey buildings for potential contamination before any demolition or renovation work is performed.
 - 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.
-

The following specific impact categories were evaluated with respect to the proposed Project in the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects, discussed below. The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously

evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information that would alter the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

a) Hazardous Materials-Transport, Use, or Disposal (*Would the Project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?)*

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.7.4(a) that the Project could contribute to less than significant impacts from the use, transport and disposal of hazardous materials during the demolition, construction, and operation of the proposed Project. For these impacts, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that inclusion of mitigation measures (LRDP Mitigations 4.7-1, 4.7-2(a-b), and 4.7-8) from the 2003 LRDP EIR would further reduce these less than significant effects.

b) Hazardous Materials-Accidental Release (*Would the Project 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?)*

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.7.4(b) that the Project could contribute to less than significant impacts from the use, transport and disposal of hazardous materials. For these impacts, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that inclusion of a mitigation measure (LRDP Mitigation 4.7-9) from the 2003 LRDP EIR would further reduce this less than significant effect.

c) Hazardous Materials-School Proximity (*Would the Project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?)*

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.7.4(c) that the Project would not result in a potentially significant impact related to the proximity of schools to hazardous materials used for the Project. For this impact, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR and that no mitigation measures were needed for this less than significant impact.

d) Hazardous Materials Sites (*Would the Project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?)*

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.7.4(d) that the Project could contribute to less than significant impacts from the presence of hazardous materials contamination at the Project site. For this impact, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that inclusion of a mitigation measure (LRDP Mitigation 4.7-12 and 4.7-13) from the 2003 LRDP EIR would further reduce this less than significant effect.

e,f) Airport Safety (*For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.7.4(e,f) that the Project would not result in a potentially significant impact related to the proximity of airport operations. For this impact, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR and that no mitigation measures were needed for this less than significant impact.

g) Impair Emergency Response (*Would the Project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.7.4(g) that the Project could contribute to a less than significant impact from the potential to impair emergency response. For these impacts, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that inclusion of a mitigation measure (LRDP Mitigation 4.7-17) from the 2003 LRDP EIR would further reduce this less than significant effect.

h) Wildland Fires (*Would the Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.7.4(h) that the Project could have no impact related to risks from wildland fires. Accordingly, no mitigation measures were needed for this issue.

9. Hydrology and Water Quality

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on hydrology and water quality are evaluated in Section 4.8 of the 2003 LRDP EIR and Section 7.8 of the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the specific effects of the Classroom and Recital Hall. The minor revision of gsf from 18,000 gsf to

17,000 gsf would not change the appearance, function, occupancy, or location of the building and would not result in any new impacts or changes to hydrology and water quality impacts of the proposed Project.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Classroom and Recital Hall would not exceed the levels of significance of hydrology and water quality impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant impacts that were not previously addressed. Mitigation measures 4.8-1, 4.8-2, 4.8-3 (a-c), 4.8-4 (a,b), 4.8-5 (a-d), 4.8-6 (a-e), 4.8-9, 4.8-10 (a-c), 4.8-11, 4.8-12, 4.8-13 (a,b), and 4.8-14 from the 2003 LRDP EIR were determined relevant to the Classroom and Recital Hall to reduce the significance of hydrology and water quality impacts to the extent feasible. These mitigation measures are listed below and are hereby incorporated into the Project. The Mitigated Negative Declaration did not identify any new mitigation measures that would further reduce the impacts of the Classroom and Recital Hall. Additionally, in preparing this addendum, the University did not identify any new mitigation measures or Project revisions that have become available since the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and that would further lessen the previously identified impacts.

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 4.8-4(a) The campus shall continue to monitor and modify its pretreatment program, WWTP

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

operation, and/or treatment processes as necessary to comply with WDRs.

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

- 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.
- 4.8-6(c) The campus shall continue to participate in regional subsidence monitoring, including by installing an extensometer, to determine the vertical location of local subsidence.
- 4.8-6(d) If shallow/intermediate aquifer monitoring or subsidence monitoring indicate 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.
- 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 4.8-3(b), which specifies construction of detention and infiltration facilities in those areas that do not discharge storm water to the Arboretum.
- 4.8-10(a) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.8-1 and 4.8-2.
- 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.
- 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.
- 4.8-11 The campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation 4.8-3(a-c) in order to prevent flooding on campus.
- 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.
- 4.8-13(a) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.8-5(a-d).
- 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

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

- 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)
- 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.
- 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).
-

The following specific impact categories were evaluated with respect to the proposed Project in the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects.

a,f) Water Quality (*Would the Project violate water quality standards or otherwise degrade water quality?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.8.4(a,f) that the Project would result in a less than significant impact on water quality and that inclusion of mitigation measures (LRDP Mitigation 4.8-1, 4.8-4 (a,b), and 4.8-12) from the 2003 LRDP EIR would further reduce this less than significant effect.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, Project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

b) Ground Water Levels (*Would the Project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.8.4(b) that the Project could contribute to demand for water and development of adequate water supplies, which could cumulatively impact ground water levels. The Mitigated Negative Declaration found that these impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR. Further, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that mitigation measures prescribed in the 2003 LRDP EIR would minimize this cumulative impact to the greatest extent feasible (LRDP Mitigations 4.8-5(a-d), 4.8-6 (a-c), and

4.8-13(a,b). While the Project would contribute to the previously identified cumulative significant impact on groundwater levels, the individual effects of the proposed Project would be less-than-significant. This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project, there are no changed Project conditions or new information that would alter the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration. No additional mitigation measures or Project revisions have been identified that would further lessen the previously identified significant impact. Therefore, the Mitigated Negative Declaration analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address impact.

c) Off-Site Erosion (*Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.8.4(c) that the Project could cumulatively contribute to soil erosion from increased water runoff. While the Project would contribute to the previously identified cumulative significant impact, the individual effects of the proposed Project would be less-than-significant. For these impacts, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR. Further, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that mitigation measures prescribed in the 2003 LRDP EIR would minimize this impact to the greatest extent feasible (LRDP Mitigations 4.8-2 and 4.8-10 (a-c)). This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. There are no changed Project conditions or new information. No additional mitigation measures or Project revisions have been identified that would further lessen the previously identified significant impact. Therefore, Mitigated Negative Declaration analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address this impact.

d,e) Flooding and Drainage System Capacity (*Would the Project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.8.4(d,e) that the Project would result in a less than significant impact to the potential to cause flooding or exceed drainage system capacity. The Mitigated Negative Declaration found that inclusion of a mitigation measure (LRDP

Mitigation 4.8-3(a) and 4.8-11) from the 2003 LRDP EIR would further reduce this less than significant effect.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no new analysis or mitigation measures are required.

g) Housing within Floodplain (*Would the Project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.8.4(g) that the Project could have no impact related to placing housing within a floodplain. Accordingly, no mitigation measures were needed for this issue.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no new analysis or mitigation measures are required.

h, i) Flood Hazards (*Would the Project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.8.4(h,i) that the Project would not result in a potentially significant impact related to flood hazards. The Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR and that no mitigation measures were needed for this less than significant impact.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

j) Inundation by Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow (*Would the Project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.8.4(j) that the Project could have no impact related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Accordingly, no mitigation measures were needed for this issue.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or new mitigation measures are required.

10. Land Use and Planning

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on land use and planning are evaluated in Section 4.9 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. Section 7.9 of the adopted Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the specific effects of the proposed Project on land use and planning. The following specific impact categories were evaluated with respect to the proposed Project in the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects. No revisions have been proposed to the Project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and no changed circumstance or new information is present. The minor revision of gsf from 18,000 gsf to 17,000 gsf would not change the appearance, function, occupancy, or location of the building and would not result in any new impacts or changes to land use and planning impacts of the proposed Project. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required, as discussed below.

a) Divide a Community (*Would the Project physically divide an established community?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded in Appendix A, Section 7.9.4(a) that the proposed Project would have no potential to physically divide an established community because the Project involves no changes that would separate one area from another area and that no impact would occur.

b) Conflict with Applicable Land Use Plan (*Would the Project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration identified in Appendix A, Section 7.9.4(b) the applicable land use plan for the campus as the 2003 LRDP and that the proposed Project is consistent with the land use designations in the 2003 LRDP. The proposed development would support the objectives of the Academic/Administrative land uses categories by providing buildings that serve

key functions of these land use categories. The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Project would have no impact relating to conflicts with land use planning.

c) Conflict with Applicable Habitat Conservation Plan (*Would the Project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration identified in Appendix A, Section 7.9.4(c) that the campus does not fall within the boundaries of, nor is it adjacent to, an adopted regional HCP or NCCP and that the Project would have no affect on an adopted HCP or NCCP and that no impact would occur.

d) Incompatible Land Uses (*Would the Project result in development of land uses that are substantially incompatible with existing adjacent land uses or with planned uses?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration identified in Appendix A, Section 7.9.4(d) that the Classroom and Recital Hall would be compatible with existing land uses and that no impact related to land use incompatibility would occur.

11. Mineral Resources

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 were determined to have no effect on mineral resources in the 2003 LRDP EIR. Section 7.10 of the adopted Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the specific effects of the proposed Project on mineral resources. The following specific impact categories were evaluated with respect to the proposed Project in the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects. No revisions have been proposed to the Project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and no changed circumstance or new information is present. The minor revision of gsf from 18,000 gsf to 17,000 gsf would not change the appearance, function, occupancy, or location of the building and would not result in any new mineral resources impacts of the proposed Project. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for mineral resources, as discussed below.

a, b) Mineral Resources and Designated Mineral Areas (*Would the Project result in loss of a mineral resource or loss of a mineral resource recovery site?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration identified in Appendix A, Section 7.10.4(a) natural gas as the only known or potential mineral resource that has been identified on campus and that natural gas can be extracted at wells placed considerable distances from deposits. The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that development on campus would not impede extraction or result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource and that no impact would occur.

12. Noise

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on noise are evaluated in Section 4.10 of the 2003 LRDP EIR and Section 7.11 of the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the specific effects of the Classroom and Recital Hall. The minor revision of gsf from 18,000 gsf to 17,000 gsf would not change the appearance, function, occupancy, or location of the building and would not result in any new impacts or changes to noise impacts of the proposed Project.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Classroom and Recital Hall would not exceed the levels of significance of noise impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant impacts that were not previously addressed. Mitigation measures 4.10-1, 4.10-2 (a,b), and 4.10-5 from the 2003 LRDP EIR were determined relevant to the Classroom and Recital Hall to reduce the significance of noise impacts to the extent feasible. These mitigation measures are listed below and are hereby incorporated into the Project. The Mitigated Negative Declaration did not identify any new Project-level mitigation measures that would further reduce the impacts of the Classroom and Recital Hall. Additionally, in preparing this addendum, the University did not identify any new mitigation measures or Project revisions that have become available since the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and that would further lessen the previously identified impacts.

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
NOISE

- 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.
- 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

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
NOISE

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 traffic growth. The campus' contribution to the City's noise abatement program could be used to extend sound walls 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.

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.

4.10-5 Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.10-1 and 4.10-2.

The following specific categories were evaluated in relation to the Project in the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects. No revisions have been proposed to the Project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and no changed circumstance or new information is present.

a) Exposure to Noise Exceeding Standards (*Would the Project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?)*

The Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.11.4(a) that during operation, the proposed Project would generate minimal noise levels and the overall noise exposure would be similar to the existing noise levels. The Classroom and Recital Hall would not be a sensitive receptor for noise considerations and is not expected to produce noise above the levels currently occurring at the Project sites. The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant noise impact. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis and no new mitigation measures are required.

b,d) Exposure to Excessive Noise and Temporary Noise Increases (*Would the Project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels or temporary increase in ambient noise levels?)*

The Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.11.4(b,d) that the proposed Project would include substantial construction noise generation at the Project site and these activities would be within 100 feet of noise sensitive uses and buildings. The 2003 LRDP EIR

found that construction of campus facilities pursuant to the 2003 LRDP could expose nearby receptors to excessive groundborne vibration and airborne or groundborne noise (Impact 4.10-1). The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that LRDP Mitigation 4.10-1 including preparation of a site specific noise control plan, would be implemented to control construction noise. The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant noise impact. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

c) Increased Ambient Noise Levels (*Would the Project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?*)

For construction and operation of Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.11.4(c) that the Project could contribute to potentially significant impacts related to implementation of the adopted air quality plan, air quality standards, cumulative effects of air emissions, and exposure of sensitive receptors to emission. For all of these impacts, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project, there are no changed Project conditions or new information that would alter the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration. This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP.

Further, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that mitigation measures prescribed in the 2003 LRDP EIR would minimize this impact to the greatest extent feasible (LRDP Mitigation 4.10-2(a-b) and LRDP Mitigation 4.10-5) No additional mitigation measures or Project revisions have been identified that would further lessen the previously identified significant cumulative impact. While the Project would contribute to the previously identified cumulative significant impact, the individual noise level effects of the proposed Project caused by increased traffic levels on area roadways would be less-than-significant. Therefore, Mitigated Negative Declaration analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address this issue adequately and this impact remains significant after mitigation.

e) Noise Levels Near Public Airports (*Would the Project result in a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration identified in Appendix A, Section 7.11.4(e) that the proposed Project development areas are approximately two miles from the campus airport. Therefore, the Project would not expose people to excessive noise levels associated with this public use airport. The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the proposed Project would have a less-than-significant noise impact from noise levels near public airports. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

f) Noise Levels Near Private Airports (Would the Project result in a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration identified in Appendix A, Section 7.11.4(f) that the University Airport is a public use airport, not a private airstrip and that no other private airport facilities are within the immediate vicinity of the campus. The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the proposed Project would have no impact on noise levels near a private airport. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

13. Population and Housing

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on population and housing are evaluated in Section 4.11 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. Section 7.12 of the adopted Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the specific effects of the proposed Project on population and housing. The following specific impact categories were evaluated with respect to the proposed Project in the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects. The minor revision of gsf from 18,000 gsf to 17,000 gsf would not change the appearance, function, occupancy, or location of the building and would not result in any new impacts or changes to population and housing impacts of the proposed Project. Additionally, in preparing this addendum, the University did not identify any new mitigation measures or Project revisions that have become available since the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and that would further lessen the previously identified impacts.

a) Induce Substantial Population Growth (Would the Project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly?)

For population effects, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.12.4(a) that the proposed Project would increase the campus population by approximately 25 people and that the proposed Project would contribute to the cumulative population growth impact identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR (Impact 4.11-1). The Mitigated Negative Declaration identified a population increase of 70 employees. The Segundo Services Center (previously approved) is expected to result in 20 of the 70 employees and Student Community Center (previously approved) resulted in an increase of 25 of the 70 employees. The Classroom and Recital Hall is expected to result in 25 of the 70 employees. Accordingly, the total anticipated

population increase of 70 employees from the three Projects remains unchanged. The impact analyses for all of the resource areas covered in the Mitigated Negative Declaration address the campus population increases associated with the Project. Where possible, the Mitigated Negative Declaration mitigates associated environmental impacts to the extent feasible. The cumulative effect of population growth associated with the 2003 LRDP, including the proposed Project, was considered a significant and unavoidable impact in the 2003 LRDP EIR. This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. No conditions have changed and no new information has become available since adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration that would alter this previous analysis.

No mitigation measures or Project revisions have been identified that would further lessen the previously identified significant impact. Therefore, Mitigated Negative Declaration analysis is sufficient and comprehensive and no additional analysis is required.

b) Displace Housing (*Would the Project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration identified in Appendix A, Section 7.12.4(b) that the proposed Project would not displace any existing housing. The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the proposed Project would have no impact on housing displacement. No revisions have been proposed to the Classroom and Recital Hall as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. There are no changed circumstances or new information. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

c) Displace People (*Would the Project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration identified in Appendix A, Section 7.12.4(c) that the proposed Project would not displace any people. The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the proposed Project would have no impact on displacing people. No revisions have been proposed to the Classroom and Recital Hall as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and no changed circumstance or new information is present. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

d) Create Demand for Housing (*Would the Project create a demand for housing that cannot be accommodated by local jurisdictions?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration identified in Appendix A, Section 7.12.4(d) that the 2003 LRDP EIR found that future housing in the region is anticipated to adequately accommodate population growth associated with the 2003 LRDP, including the proposed Project, as well as other population growth in the region. The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the

potential for campus growth to create a demand for housing that could not be accommodated by local jurisdictions would be a less than significant impact. No revisions have been proposed to the Classroom and Recital Hall as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and no changed circumstance or new information is present. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

14. Public Services

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on public services are evaluated in Section 4.12 of the 2003 LRDP EIR and Section 7.13 of the Project Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the specific effects of the Classroom and Recital Hall. The minor revision of gsf from 18,000 gsf to 17,000 gsf would not change the appearance, function, occupancy, or location of the building and would not result in any new impacts or changes to public services impacts of the proposed Project.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Classroom and Recital Hall would not exceed the levels of significance of public services impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant impacts that were not previously addressed. Mitigation measures 4.12-6 and 4.12-7 from the 2003 LRDP EIR were determined relevant to the Classroom and Recital Hall to reduce the significance of public services impacts to the extent feasible. These mitigation measures are listed below and are hereby incorporated into the Project. The Mitigated Negative Declaration did not identify any new mitigation measures that would further reduce the impacts of the Classroom and Recital Hall. Additionally, in preparing this addendum, the University did not identify any new mitigation measures or Project revisions that have become available since the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and that would further lessen the previously identified impacts.

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures **PUBLIC SERVICES**

- 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 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.
- 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 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.
-

The following specific impact categories were evaluated with respect to the Project in the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects. For each of the following sub-topics, the Mitigated Negative Declaration assessed whether the Project would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services.

a, i&ii) Fire and Police Protection

The Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the proposed Project and an associated increase of 25 employees to the campus population would incrementally contribute to the demand for fire and police services that were anticipated under the 2003 LRDP. The expansion and construction of police and fire facilities under the 2003 LRDP could contribute to the 2003 LRDP's effects on air, noise, traffic, agriculture, biological resources, cultural resources, utilities, and other resource areas. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR for these resources and the relatively small areas that would be disturbed for construction of facilities would result in this impact remaining less-than-significant. No revisions have been proposed to the Classroom and Recital Hall as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and no changed circumstance or new information is present. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

a, iii) Schools

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.13.4(a,iii) that Projected increase of 25 employees to the campus population could contribute to the number of school-age people living in the region. For this impact, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the cumulative impacts associated with LRDP implementation, including the Project, were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR. Further, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that mitigation measures prescribed in the 2003 LRDP EIR would minimize this impact to the greatest extent feasible (LRDP Mitigations 4.12-7). This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation and there are no changed Project conditions or new information. No additional mitigation measures or Project revisions have been identified that would further lessen the previously identified significant cumulative impact. Therefore, Mitigated Negative Declaration analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address this impact adequately and no additional analysis is required

a, v) Libraries

The Projected increase of 20 employees to the campus population from the Classroom and Recital Hall could contribute to the demand for library services in the region. The Mitigated Negative Declaration identified in Appendix A, Section 7.13.4(a,v) this impact as less-than-significant. No revisions have been proposed to the Classroom and Recital Hall as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and no changed circumstance or new information is present. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

15. Recreation

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on recreation are evaluated in Section 4.13 of the 2003 LRDP EIR and Section 7.14 of the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the specific effects of the Classroom and Recital Hall.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Classroom and Recital Hall would not exceed the levels of significance of recreation impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant impacts that were not previously addressed. Mitigation measure 4.13-2 from the 2003 LRDP EIR was determined relevant to the Classroom and Recital Hall to reduce the significance of recreation impacts. This mitigation measure is listed below and is hereby incorporated into the Project. The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that no additional Project-level mitigation was required to reduce the impacts of the Classroom and Recital Hall on recreational resources to a less than significant level. Additionally, in preparing this addendum, the University did not identify any new mitigation measures or Project revisions that have become available since the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and that would further lessen the previously identified impacts.

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures RECREATION

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 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.

The following specific items were evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects.

a) **Physical Deterioration** (*Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*); or, b) **Construction of New Facilities** (*Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration Projected that the proposed Project would contribute 25 employees to the campus population and this would contribute to demand for parks and recreation facilities on and off campus. The Mitigated Negative Declaration identified in Appendix A, Section 7.14.4(a,b) that this impact would be less than significant in accordance with the analysis contained in the 2003 LRDP EIR and the continued implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.13-2. No revisions have been proposed to the Classroom and Recital Hall as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and no changed circumstance or new information is present. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

16. Traffic, Circulation, and Parking

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on traffic, circulation, and parking are evaluated in Section 4.15 of the 2003 LRDP EIR and Section 7.14 of the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the specific effects of the Classroom and Recital Hall. The minor revision of gsf from 18,000 gsf to 17,000 gsf would not change the appearance, function, occupancy, or location of the building and would not result in any new impacts or changes to traffic, circulation, and parking of the proposed Project.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Classroom and Recital Hall would not exceed the levels of significance of traffic, circulation, and parking impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant impacts that were not previously addressed. Mitigation measures 4.14-1 (a-c), 4.14-2 (a-c), 4.14-3 (a,b), 4.14-4, and 4.14-5 from the 2003 LRDP EIR were determined relevant to the Classroom and Recital Hall to reduce the significance of traffic, circulation, and parking impacts to the extent feasible. These mitigation measures are listed below and are hereby incorporated into the Project. In addition, the Mitigated Negative Declaration identified Project-Specific Mitigation 1 to reduce the circulation impacts during construction of the Classroom and Recital Hall. Additionally, in preparing this addendum, the University did not identify any new mitigation measures or Project revisions that have become available since the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and that would further lessen the previously identified impacts.

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
TRANSPORTATION, CIRCULATION, & PARKING

- 4.14-1(a) UC Davis shall continue to actively pursue Transportation Demand Management strategies to reduce vehicle-trips to and from campus.
 - 4.14-1(b) UC Davis shall continue to monitor AM and PM peak hour traffic operations at critical intersections and roadways on campus.
 - 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.
 - 4.14-2(a) UC Davis shall continue to actively pursue Transportation Demand Management strategies to reduce vehicle-trips to and from campus.
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - 4.14-3(a) UC Davis shall continue to actively pursue Transportation Demand Management strategies to reduce parking demand.
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - 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.
-

The following specific impact categories were evaluated in relation to the Project in the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects.

- a) Traffic Increases Above Criteria** (*Would the Project result in an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?*); or
- b) Exceed a Level of Service**

Standard (*Would the Project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*)

For construction and operation of Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.15.4(a,b) that the Project could cumulatively contribute to potentially significant impacts related to traffic operations at intersections on and off campus. The Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the cumulative impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR. Further, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that mitigation measures prescribed in the 2003 LRDP EIR would minimize this impact to the greatest extent feasible (LRDP Mitigations 4.14-1 (a-c) and 4.14-2 (a-c)) and that no additional Project-level mitigation measures had been identified to further reduce the impact. This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, Project location, construction techniques, and building operation. There are no changed Project conditions or new information. No additional mitigation measures or Project revisions have been identified since the Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted that would further lessen the previously identified significant cumulative impact. Therefore, Mitigated Negative Declaration analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address this impact adequately and no further analysis is required.

c) Change Air Traffic Patterns (*Would the Project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?*)

Impacts related to safety risks associated with the UC Davis airport were discussed in Section 7.7 of the Mitigated Negative Declaration in Appendix A, Section 7.15.4(c) and determined to be less-than-significant. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

d) Hazardous Design Features (*Would the Project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*)

For hazardous design features, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.15.4(d) that the proposed Project could result in a potentially significant Project-specific impact and adopted a Project-specific mitigation measure to reduce the identified impact to a less-than-significant level. During construction of the Classroom and Recital Hall, campus sidewalks and bikepaths could be closed. These closures may result in inadequate access to campus facilities resulting in increased use of roadways or landscaping areas for pedestrian and bicyclist access. Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 1 would provide detours and a required campus approval for all detour plans associated with the proposed Project. The proposed detours

would provide pedestrians and other users with a path of travel meeting wheelchair, pedestrian, and bicyclist needs and would be designed to accommodate the volume of users in the UC Davis core campus.

Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 1: The proposed Project shall include a detour plan for all sidewalk and bikepath closures. The detour plan will be approved by the campus Facilities and Enterprise Policy Coordinating Committee and will include appropriate signage, surfacing, and width to accommodate the expected volume of pedestrians, wheelchairs, and bikes.

With inclusion of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 1, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded this impact would be less than significant. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

e) Inadequate Emergency Access (*Would the Project result in inadequate emergency access?*)

Impacts related to safety risks associated with emergency access were discussed in Section 7.7 of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and determined to be less-than-significant impacts. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

f) Inadequate Parking Capacity (*Would the Project result in inadequate parking capacity?*)

For construction and operation of Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.15.4(f) that the Project could contribute to a cumulative demand for automobile parking. The Mitigated Negative Declaration identified that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.14-3(a-b) would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

g) Conflict with Alternative Transportation Programs (*Would the Project result in conflict with applicable adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*)

For construction and operation of Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the Project could cause conflicts with applicable adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. The Mitigated Negative Declaration identified that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.14-4 would reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

17. Utilities

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on utilities are evaluated in Section 4.15 of the 2003 LRDP EIR and Section 7.16 of the Project Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration evaluated the specific effects of the Classroom and Recital Hall. The minor revision of gsf from 18,000 gsf to 17,000 gsf would not change the appearance, function, occupancy, or location of the building and would not result in any new impacts or changes to utilities impacts of the proposed Project.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Classroom and Recital Hall would not exceed the levels of significance of utilities impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant impacts that were not previously addressed. Mitigation measures 4.15-1(a,b), 4.15-2(a,b), 4.15-3, 4.15-4, 4.15-6(a,b), 4.15-7(a,b), 4.15-8, 4.15-9, and 4.15-10 from the 2003 LRDP EIR were determined relevant to the Classroom and Recital Hall to reduce the significance of utilities impacts to the extent feasible. These mitigation measures are listed below and are hereby incorporated into the Project. The Mitigated Negative Declaration did not identify any new mitigation measures that would further reduce the impacts of the Classroom and Recital Hall. Additionally, in preparing this addendum, the University did not identify any new mitigation measures or Project revisions that have become available since the adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and that would further lessen the previously identified impacts.

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

- 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.
- 4.15-1(b) Implement domestic water conservation strategies as indicated in LRDP Mitigation 4.8-5(a) (see Section 7.8 Hydrology and Water Quality of this Tiered Initial Study).
- 4.15-2(a) Once preliminary project design is developed, the campus shall review each project to determine whether 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.
- 4.15-2(b) Implement utility water conservation strategies as indicated in LRDP Mitigation 4.8-6(a) (see Section 7.8 Hydrology and Water Quality of this Tiered Initial Study).

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 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.
-

The following specific impact categories were evaluated in relation to the Project in the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects.

a) Wastewater Requirements *(Would the Project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?)*

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.16.4(a) that the Project could contribute effluent to the campus wastewater treatment plant. For this impact, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR. Further, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that mitigation measures prescribed in the 2003 LRDP EIR (LRDP Mitigation 4.8-1, 4.8-4 (a,b), and 4.8-12) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

b) Construction of Water Supply or Treatment Facilities *(Would the Project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?)*

For construction and operation of Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.16.4(b) that the Project could contribute to potentially significant impacts related to domestic water facilities, utility water facilities, wastewater facilities. For all of these impacts, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR. Further, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that mitigation measures prescribed in the 2003 LRDP EIR (LRDP Mitigation 4.15-1 (a,b), 4.15-1 (a,b), 4.15-3, and 4.15-10) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

c) Construction of Stormwater Facilities *(Would the Project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?)*

For construction and operation of Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.16.4(c) that the Project could contribute to potentially significant impacts related to construction of stormwater facilities. For all of these impacts, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR. Further, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that mitigation

measures prescribed in the 2003 LRDP EIR (LRDP Mitigation 4.15-4) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

d) Available Water Supplies (*Would the Project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.16.4(d) that while the Project demand would be less-than-significant, the Project would cumulatively contribute to demand for water and development of adequate water supplies. For these impacts, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR. Further, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that mitigation measures prescribed in the 2003 LRDP EIR would minimize this impact to the greatest extent feasible (LRDP Mitigations 4.8-5(a-d), 4.8-6 (a-c), and 4.8-13(a,b)). No additional mitigation measures or Project revisions were identified in the Mitigated Negative Declaration that would further lessen the previously identified impact. No new mitigation measure or Project revisions have been identified since the Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted that would further reduce the previously identified significant cumulative impact. This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, Therefore, Mitigated Negative Declaration analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to address this cumulative impact adequately and no additional analysis is required.

e) Wastewater Service Capacity (*Would the Project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's Projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.16.4(e) that the Project could contribute to potentially significant impacts related to wastewater service capacity. For all of these impacts, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR. Further, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that mitigation measures prescribed in the 2003 LRDP EIR (LRDP Mitigation 4.15-3) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

f) Landfill Capacity (*Would the Project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.16.4(f) that the Project could contribute to potentially significant impacts related to wastewater service capacity. For all of these impacts, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR and that no mitigation measures were needed for this less than significant impact.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

g) Solid Waste Regulations (*Would the Project require or result in the construction or expansion of electrical, natural gas, chilled water, or steam facilities, which would cause significant environmental impacts?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.16.4(g) that the Project could have no impact on solid waste regulations and would meet all such requirements. Accordingly, no mitigation measures were needed for this issue.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.

h,i) Expansion of Utility (*Would the Project require or result in the construction or expansion of electrical, natural gas, chilled water, or steam facilities, which would cause significant environmental impacts?*); or, **Telecommunication Infrastructure** (*Would the Project result in require or result in the construction or expansion of telecommunication facilities, which would cause significant environmental impacts?*)

For construction and operation of the Classroom and Recital Hall, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.16.4(h,i) that the Project could cumulatively contribute to potentially significant impacts related expansion of utility and telecommunication infrastructure. For all of these impacts, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the cumulative impacts were adequately addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR. Further, the Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that mitigation measures prescribed in the 2003 LRDP EIR (LRDP Mitigation 4.15-6(a,b), 4.15-7(a), 4.15-8, and 4.15-9) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

The proposed Classroom and Recital Hall matches the Project evaluated in the Mitigated Negative Declaration in terms of approximate size, project location, construction techniques, and building operation. Because the Project remains unchanged from the previously evaluated Project and there are no changed Project conditions or new information, the conclusions of the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required.