

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS
IN CONNECTION WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION
OF THE SEGUNDO SERVICES CENTER, DAVIS CAMPUS**

I. DESIGN APPROVAL OF THE SEGUNDO SERVICES CENTER

The findings set forth below support the approval of the Segundo Services Center (the Project) Pursuant to Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 15074(b). The Facilities and Enterprise Policy Committee (FEPC) of the University of California, Davis campus (the campus) pursuant to authority delegated from the Board of Regents of the University of California (The Regents) (hereinafter referred to collectively as “the University”), hereby finds that a Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted by the University on February 19, 2009 in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq. (CEQA) in connection with the University’s approval of the Chilled Water Phase 7 project and that the Mitigated Negative Declaration included an analysis of the Project, which as discussed in these Findings also serves as the CEQA compliance document for approving the Project.

The Project is one of four projects analyzed in the adopted 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration and proposed for implementation in the central campus at UC Davis. The Mitigated Negative Declaration is tiered from UC Davis’ Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which was certified by The Regents in November 2003. The Project is consistent with the 2003 LRDP, which describes the scope and nature of campus development through 2015-16, as well as land use principles and policies to guide the location, scale and design of individual capital projects, and identifies measures to mitigate the significant adverse impacts and cumulative impacts associated with that growth.

On February 19, 2009 the University approved the Chilled Water 7 project, the first project approved among the four projects evaluated in the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration. In connection with the approval of the Chilled Water Phase 7 project, the University determined that the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration reflected the independent judgment and analysis of the University and adopted the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

II. FINDINGS

The University hereby adopts the following Findings pursuant to Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 15074, in conjunction with the approval of the Project, which is set forth in Section III, below.

A. Background

The Project is one of four projects evaluated in the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration and is the second of the four projects analyzed therein for which approval has been requested. 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 being implemented. The project will extend underground chilled water and steam utilities through the core campus to provide increased distribution for the chilled water system. The Chilled Water Phase 7 includes approximately 3,500 linear feet of chilled water and steam piping and the construction process will occupy a corridor approximately 30 feet in width.

Segundo Services Center. The Segundo Services Center would provide a new building to serve ancillary functions for campus housing occupants and would install a new landscaped area within the core of the Segundo housing area on approximately 3.5 acres east of La Rue Road. The Segundo Services Center development would involve the construction of a three-story building on a site immediately west of the existing Segundo Dining commons and occupy a portion of an existing parking lot that would be decreased from approximately 40 to approximately 10 spaces after construction. The existing Segundo Dining Commons building would be demolished as a part of the project allowing for completion of a central quad area consistent with the district master plan. The development is approximately 35,500 gross square feet (gsf) and 21,300 assignable square feet (asf) and includes a new mechanical room for steam generation to serve the proposed Segundo Services Center building and the for adjacent existing Segundo dormitory buildings.

Since the completion of the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Project Mitigated Negative Declaration the on-going design process for the Segundo Services Center Project has resulted in minor modifications to the building area proposed for the project. The modification to the building area would result in an increase in the gsf from the original evaluation of 33,300 gsf to the current design of approximately 35,500 gsf. The increased area is a result of additional building space in common areas such as building entries and hallways and additional space for mechanical equipment. In particular, the design focus of providing quality space for students resulted in increased space in the main lobby of the building. In addition to the modified amount of area of gsf, the building design process changed the amount of projected asf from the prior design estimate of 23,100 asf to the current design of 21,300. The reduced amount of assignable square footage was a result of achieving dual usage of particular spaces to meet the overall design needs for the building activities. Dual usage of certain spaces allowed the amount of asf to decrease to the current proposal of 21,300 asf. The building location, function, and exterior design elements remain unchanged. Similarly, the construction techniques and scheduling remain unchanged from the descriptions provided in the adopted 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Student Community Center. As described in the adopted 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Student Community Center would occupy a site of approximately two acres to provide space for student support functions such as food service, lounges, studying space, and counseling space. The Center would construct an approximately 40,000 gsf (26,300 asf) facility for several student service programs that focus on student life, campus diversity, and campus community development. The Center will enhance the quality of student life by providing inviting spaces that reinforce academic success while offering a relaxed, comfortable and informal environment. The Center would be located within the core campus and would include landscaping along the perimeter of the development site. The site currently includes a collection of 15 one-story temporary buildings that would be demolished prior to construction.

Music Instruction and Recital Building. The Music Instruction and Recital Building (MIRB) would occupy a site of approximately one acre within the core campus near the existing Music Building. The MIRB would be located within the core campus and would include landscaping along the perimeter of the development site. The MIRB would provide approximately 18,000 gsf (10,100 asf) located adjacent to the existing Music Building on Hutchison Drive. The MIRB would include a recital hall designed for appropriate acoustical standards, built specifically to accommodate small to medium-sized instrumental and choral performances. The existing building at the site was previously a campus steam generation building but is currently unused and will be demolished as part of the development and an adjacent temporary building (the Old Firehouse) will also be demolished.

B. Environmental Review Process

A Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 2008112090) was prepared for the four above-described projects, which includes the proposed Segundo Services Center project that is the subject of these Findings, in accordance with CEQA and the University of California Procedures for Implementation of CEQA. The Mitigated Negative Declaration, in accordance with Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines, is tiered from the campus 2003 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report (2003 LRDP EIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 2002109092), which was certified by The Regents in connection with the approval of the 2003 LRDP in November 2003.

The Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects are part of the physical development proposed in the 2003 LRDP; therefore, the environmental analysis for the Project is presented and analyzed within the context of the 2003 LRDP and incorporates by reference applicable portions of the 2003 LRDP EIR. The 2003 LRDP EIR, which is a program EIR pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines, analyzes the overall effects of campus growth and facility development through 2015-16, and identifies measures to mitigate the significant adverse impacts and cumulative impacts associated with that growth.

As a tiered document, the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects relies on the 2003 LRDP EIR for: (1) a discussion of general background and setting information for environmental topic areas; (2) overall growth-related issues; (3) issues that were evaluated in sufficient detail in the 2003 LRDP EIR for which there are no significant new information, changes in the project, or changes in circumstances that would require further analysis; and (4) cumulative impacts. The purpose of the Mitigated Negative Declaration is to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects with respect to the existing 2003 LRDP EIR analysis in order to determine what level of additional environmental review, if any, would be appropriate.

The University adopted the Mitigated Negative Declaration in February 2009 in connection with the design approval consideration of the Chilled Water 7 project. As one of the four Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, the potential impacts of the Project were analyzed for the following environmental topic areas: (1) aesthetics, (2) agricultural resources, (3) air quality, (4) biological resources, (5) cultural resources, (6) geology, soils, and seismicity, (7) hazards and hazardous materials, (8) hydrology and water quality, (9) land use and planning, (10) mineral resources, (11) noise, (12) population and housing, (13) public services, (14) recreation, (15) transportation, circulation and parking, and (16) utilities and service systems.

Based on the analysis contained in adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration it was determined that the proposed Project would result in one potentially significant effect on the environment that was not previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, and that a new project-specific mitigation measure would reduce this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant level. In addition, the University found that the proposed Project may incrementally contribute to, but would not exceed, significant environmental cumulative impacts previously identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR with regard to the following topic areas: air quality, archaeological resources, groundwater, water quality, noise, public services, traffic levels, and wastewater treatment.

C. Relation of the Segundo Services Center to the LRDP EIR

The 2003 LRDP EIR is a Program EIR, prepared pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Sections 15000 et seq.) and Section 21080.09 of the Public Resources Code. The 2003 LRDP EIR analyzed full implementation of uses and physical development proposed under the 2003 LRDP through the year 2015-16 to accommodate a projected total enrollment level of 31,500 students, and identified measures to mitigate the significant adverse direct and cumulative impacts associated with that growth. The Segundo Services Center would result in no increase in student enrollment levels and could result in approximately 20 new employees. The current campus population is consistent with the campus population that was anticipated in the 2003 LRDP and evaluated in the 2003 LRDP EIR.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects is tiered from the 2003 LRDP EIR in accordance with Sections 15152 and 15168(d) of the CEQA Guidelines and Public Resources Code Section 21094. Based on the analysis presented in the Mitigated Negative Declaration, one project-specific impact is identified and a project-specific mitigation measure is proposed.

The University has reviewed and considered the certified LRDP EIR, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects, and the findings adopted in support of the approval of the 2003 LRDP and the Chilled Water Phase 7 project, and finds, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, that these documents contain the environmental analysis and information necessary to support approval of the Project and that no further environmental analysis is required as discussed in Section D, below.

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, 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. Further, the Project does not effect the mitigation measures and mitigation measures monitoring program adopted in connection with the approval of the 2003 LRDP and the adopted 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 major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for aesthetics and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for aesthetics, as discussed below.

a) Scenic Vistas

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 Segundo Services Center 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,c) Scenic Resources and Visual Character

The Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.1.4(b and c) that the Segundo Services Center 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

The adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.1.4(d) that the Segundo Services Center 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 Initial Study evaluated the specific effects of the Segundo Services Center. 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 major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for agricultural resources and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for agricultural resources, as discussed below.

a) Conversion of Farmland

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded in Appendix A, Section 7.2.4(a) that the Segundo Services Center 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 Center would not convert agricultural lands.

b) Williamson Act Contracts

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 Segundo Services Center would have no effect on Williamson Act Contracts.

c) Other Changes to Result in Conversion of Farmland

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Segundo Services Center 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 Initial Study evaluated the specific effects of the Segundo Services Center. No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for air quality and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for air quality, as discussed below.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Segundo Services Center 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 Segundo Services Center 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 Segundo Services Center.

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
AIR QUALITY

4.3-1(a) Vehicular Sources. The following measures will be implemented to reduce emissions

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

AIR QUALITY

from vehicles, as feasible.

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

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

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

AIR QUALITY

- 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).
- 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

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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). 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for air emissions and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for air emissions, as discussed below. 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. Therefore, the Mitigated Negative Declaration analysis is sufficient and comprehensive to adequately address this impact and no further environmental documentation is required.

e) 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 Segundo Services Center 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 major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for odors and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for odors.

f) Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded in Appendix A, Section 7.3.4(f) that the Segundo Services Center would result in greenhouse gas emissions from construction equipment and long-term operation. Although the Center would result in buildings that achieve a LEED Certified 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

major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for greenhouse gas emissions and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for greenhouse gas emissions.

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 Initial Study evaluated the specific effects of the Segundo Services Center.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Segundo Services Center 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 Segundo Services Center 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.

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

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- 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 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. No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for biological resources and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for biological resources, as discussed below.

a) Effect on Special-Status Species

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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

For the Segundo Services Center, 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 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Initial Study evaluated the specific effects of the Segundo Services Center.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Segundo Services Center 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 Segundo Services Center 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.

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,

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

CULTURAL RESOURCES

regarding how to recognize archaeological sites and artifacts. In addition, campus employees whose work routinely involves disturbing the soil shall be informed how to recognize evidence of potential archaeological sites and artifacts. Prior to disturbing the soil, contractors shall be notified that they are required to watch for potential archaeological sites and artifacts and to notify the campus if any are found. In the event of a find, the campus shall implement item (vi), below.

(ii) For project sites requiring a moderate or intensive level of investigation, a surface survey shall be conducted by a qualified archaeologist during project planning and design and prior to soil disturbing activities. For sites requiring moderate investigation, in the event of a surface find, intensive investigation will be implemented, as per item (iii), below. Irrespective of findings, the qualified archaeologist shall, in consultation with the campus, develop an archaeological monitoring plan to be implemented during the construction phase of the project. The frequency and duration of monitoring shall be adjusted in accordance with survey results, the nature of construction activities, and results during the monitoring period. In the event of a discovery, the campus shall implement item (vi), below.

(iii) For project sites requiring intensive investigation, irrespective of subsurface finds, the campus shall retain a qualified archaeologist to conduct a subsurface investigation of the project site, to ascertain whether buried archaeological materials are present and, if so, the extent of the deposit relative to the project's area of potential effects. If an archaeological deposit is discovered, the archaeologist will prepare a site record and file it with the California Historical Resource Information System.

(iv) If it is determined through step (iii), above, that the resource extends into the project's area of potential effects, the resource will be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist, who will determine whether it qualifies as a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource under the criteria of CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5. If the resource does not qualify, or if no resource is present within the project area of potential effects (APE), this will be noted in the environmental document and no further mitigation is required unless there is a discovery during construction (see (vi), below).

(v) If a resource within the project APE is determined to qualify as an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource (as defined by CEQA), the campus shall consult with the qualified archaeologist to consider means of avoiding or reducing ground disturbance within the site boundaries, including minor modifications of building footprint, landscape modification, the placement of protective fill, the establishment of a preservation easement, or other means that will permit avoidance or substantial preservation in place of the resource. If avoidance or

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

CULTURAL RESOURCES

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 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

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

CULTURAL RESOURCES

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).

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).

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
CULTURAL RESOURCES

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. No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for cultural resources and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for cultural resources, as discussed below.

a) Historic Resources

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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 major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for geology, soils, and seismicity and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for geology, soils, and seismicity, as discussed below. 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

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) Seismic 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

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

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

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

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

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. 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 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Initial Study evaluated the specific effects of the Segundo Services Center.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Segundo Services Center 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 Segundo Services Center 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.

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- 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. No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for hazards and hazardous materials and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for hazards and hazardous materials, as discussed below.

a) Hazardous Materials-Transport, Use, or Disposal

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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. 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

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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 construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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.

8. 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 Initial Study evaluated the specific effects of the Segundo Services Center.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Segundo Services Center 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 Segundo Services Center 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 Segundo Services Center.

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.

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

- 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 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

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

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.
- 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.

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

- 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 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

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY

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

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.8.4(a,f) that the project would create a less than significant impact impair water quality. However, the Mitigated Negative Declaration found 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for hydrology and water quality and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for hydrology and water quality.

b) Ground Water Levels

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for ground water levels and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for ground water levels. 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

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for off-site erosion and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for off-site erosion. 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

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for flooding and drainage system capacity and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for flooding and drainage system capacity.

g) Housing within Floodplain

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for housing within the floodplain and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for housing within the floodplain.

h, i) Flood Hazards

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for flood hazards and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for flood hazards.

j) Inundation by Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for inundation and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for inundation.

9. 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 major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for land use and planning and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for land use and planning, as discussed below.

a) Divide a 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

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

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 effect on an adopted HCP or NCCP and that no impact would occur.

d) Incompatible Land Uses

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

10. 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.

a, b) Mineral Resources and Designated Mineral Areas

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. No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for mineral resources and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for mineral resources.

11. 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 Initial Study evaluated the specific effects of the Segundo Services Center.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Segundo Services Center 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 Segundo Services Center 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 Segundo Services Center.

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 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

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

NOISE

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 major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for noise and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for noise, as discussed below.

a) Exposure to Noise Exceeding Standards

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 Segundo Services Center 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. No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for noise standards and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the

previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for noise standards.

b,d) Exposure to Excessive Noise and Temporary Noise Increases

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. No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for temporary noise increases and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for temporary noise increases.

c) Increased Ambient Noise Levels

For construction and operation of Segundo Services Center, 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for ambient noise levels and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for ambient noise levels.

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

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. No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for airport noise and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for airport noise.

f) Noise Levels Near Private Airports

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. No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for airport noise and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for airport noise.

12. 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. No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for population and housing and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged

from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for population and housing.

a) Induce Substantial Population Growth

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 20 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 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for population growth and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for population growth.

b) Displace Housing

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 major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for housing effects and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for housing effects.

c) Displace People

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 major revisions have

been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for displacing people and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for displacing people.

d) Create Demand for Housing

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 major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for housing demand and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for housing demand, as discussed below.

13. 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 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Initial Study evaluated the specific effects of the Segundo Services Center.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Segundo Services Center 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 Segundo Services Center 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 Segundo Services Center.

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.

a, i&ii) Fire and Police Protection

The Mitigated Negative Declaration found that the proposed project and an associated increase of 20 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 major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for fire and police and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for fire and police.

a, iii) Schools

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, the adopted Mitigated Negative Declaration found in Appendix A, Section 7.13.4(a,iii) that projected increase of 20 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for schools and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for schools.

a, v) Libraries

The projected increase of 20 employees to the campus population from the Segundo Services Center 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 major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for libraries and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for libraries.

14. 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 Initial Study evaluated the specific effects of the Segundo Services Center.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Segundo Services Center 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 Segundo

Services Center 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 Segundo Services Center on recreational resources to a less than significant level.

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,b) Physical Deterioration and Construction of New Facilities

The Mitigated Negative Declaration projected that the proposed project would contribute 20 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 major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for construction of new recreation facilities and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for construction of new recreation facilities.

15. 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 Initial Study evaluated the specific effects of the Segundo Services Center.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Segundo Services Center 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 Segundo Services Center 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 Segundo Services Center.

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

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
TRANSPORTATION, CIRCULATION, & PARKING

- 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,b) Traffic Increases Above Criteria

For construction and operation of Segundo Services Center, 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for traffic delay and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially

unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for traffic delay.

c) Change Air Traffic Patterns

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. No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for air traffic patterns and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for air traffic patterns.

d) Hazardous Design Features

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 Segundo Services Center, 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 Declaration concluded this impact would be less than significant. No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for traffic hazards and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for traffic hazards.

e) 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. No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for emergency access and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for emergency access.

f) Inadequate Parking Capacity

For construction and operation of Segundo Services Center, 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for parking capacity and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for parking capacity.

g) Conflict with Alternative Transportation Programs

For construction and operation of Segundo Services Center, 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for alternative transportation programs and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for alternative transportation programs.

16. 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 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Initial Study evaluated the specific effects of the Segundo Services Center.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration concluded that the Segundo Services Center 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 Segundo Services Center 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 Segundo Services Center.

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).
- 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

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

- 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
-

2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for wastewater requirements and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for wastewater requirements.

b) Construction of Water Supply or Treatment Facilities

For construction and operation of Segundo Services Center, 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for water supply facilities and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for water supply facilities.

c) Construction of Stormwater Facilities

For construction and operation of Segundo Services Center, 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for construction of stormwater facilities and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for construction of stormwater facilities.

d) Available Water Supplies

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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 of 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section

II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for water supplies and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for water supplies.

e) Wastewater Service Capacity

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for wastewater service capacity and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for wastewater service capacity.

f) Landfill Capacity

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for landfill capacity and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for landfill capacity, as discussed below.

g) Solid Waste Regulations

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for solid waste and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for solid waste.

h,i) Expansion of Utility and Telecommunication Infrastructure

For construction and operation of the Segundo Services Center, 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.

No major revisions have been proposed to the project as analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. The minor revisions in proposed building area gsf and asf as described in Section II.A of these findings, would not change the previous impact analysis for utility and telecommunication infrastructure and would not result in new or altered environmental impacts. Because the project remains substantially unchanged from the previously evaluated project, the conclusions of the Mitigated Negative Declaration remain valid and therefore no additional analysis or mitigation measures are required for utility and telecommunication infrastructure.

E. Additional Findings

1. Incorporation by Reference

These Findings incorporate by reference in their entirety the text of the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects; the 2003 LRDP; the 2003 LRDP EIR, the 2003 LRDP Mitigation Monitoring Program, and the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. Without limitation, this incorporation is intended to elaborate on the scope and nature of mitigation measures, project and cumulative impacts, and the basis for determining the significance of impacts, and the reasons for approving the project.

2. Mitigation Monitoring Program

When making findings, a lead agency must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project that it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The proposed Project includes one project-specific mitigation measure and accordingly, a mitigation monitoring program is required. The mitigation monitoring program includes details of the timing and responsibilities for completing the identified project-specific mitigation measure and is included as Appendix A to the Initial Study. In addition, the Project incorporates all applicable mitigation measures contained in the 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Monitoring Program. All relevant 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures identified in the Final Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration will be monitored through the LRDP EIR Mitigation Monitoring Program adopted by the University in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP in order to ensure compliance during Project implementation.

3. Record of Proceedings

Various documents and other materials constitute the record of proceedings upon which the University bases its findings and decisions contained herein. Most documents related to this project are located in the campus Office of Resource Management and Planning, University of California, One Shields Avenue, 376 Mrak Hall, Davis, California 95616. The record of proceedings for the 2003 LRDP approval is also located in the Office of Resource Management and Planning. The custodian for these documents is the Office of Resource Management and Planning.

3. Adequacy of Prior Environmental Review

All of the environmental effects of the Project have been adequately addressed in prior environmental documentation and: (1) have been mitigated or avoided, (2) have been examined at a sufficient level of detail in the prior environmental documentation to enable those effects to be mitigated or avoided by site specific revisions, the imposition of conditions, or by other means in connection with the approval of the Project, or (3) cannot be mitigated to avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts despite the University's willingness to accept all feasible mitigation measures.

The minor revisions to the building area for the Segundo Services Center Project (described in Section II.A, above) were considered in Section II.D, above, to ensure that the environmental effects of the project (as modified) were adequately assessed by the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration. After consideration of the minor revisions, the University has concluded that that there are no substantial changes to the project or changed circumstances that would increase the severity of the environmental impacts or result in a new potentially significant impact beyond the levels

identified in the Initial Study. Further, through consideration of all relevant information, the University has concluded that:

- The project will have no significant effects that were not previously considered in the mitigated negative declaration; and
- Significant effects of the project will not be substantially more severe than identified in the mitigated negative declaration; and
- There are no mitigation measures or alternatives previously found to be not feasible that would in fact, now be feasible; and
- There are no considerably different mitigation measures or alternatives than those previously analyzed that could now substantially reduce significant effects on the environment.

The Project is consistent with the 2003 LRDP and the regional or area wide cumulative impacts of the Project have already been adequately addressed, as defined in Guidelines Section 15152(e). These Findings re-affirm the findings for the UC Davis 2003 LRDP EIR, including the Statement of Overriding Considerations, and the findings of the Chilled Water Phase 7 project.

4. Additional Considerations

Section 15093(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines provides that when the decision of the public agency results in the occurrence of significant impacts that are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency must state in writing the reasons to support its actions. The Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP and certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR previously addressed all of the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with implementation of the LRDP, and the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects concluded that the impacts associated the Project are within the scope of impacts analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR. The University balanced the benefits of the LRDP implementation against the significant and unavoidable adverse environmental effects, discussed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP, in determining that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of this project outweigh these adverse environmental effects, and adopted Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP, which herein determined to be equally relevant to, and are reaffirmed as a part of, this Project.

G. Summary

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

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

b. The Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects identified a project-specific mitigation measure to mitigate a potentially significant project-specific impact to a less-than-significant level.

c. Any significant cumulative impacts to which the Segundo Services Center contributes and that are found to be unavoidable were fully analyzed and adequately addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, as documented in the Initial Study and Negative Declaration for the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects, and are considered acceptable due to the factors described and adopted in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations in adopted in connection with The Regents' approval of the 2003 LRDP as described in Section II.F, above, which are herein re-affirmed.

d. Beyond the project-specific impact identified in item (b) above, which is mitigated to a less than significant level with identified project-specific mitigation, the Segundo Services Center will not result in any new significant environmental effects or substantially increase the severity of the significant environmental effects previously identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR.

e. This determination reflects the University's independent judgment and analysis.

III. APPROVAL

The University hereby takes the following actions:

- A.** Approves and incorporates into the Project all project elements, Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 1, the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects, and relevant 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures identified in these Findings as more specifically described in the 2008-2009 Central Campus Major Capital Improvement Projects Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.
- B.** Adopts the Findings in their entirety as set forth in Section II, above.

- C.** Having independently reviewed and analyzed the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Tiered Initial Study and any comments received on these documents, and adopted the Findings, the University hereby approves the design and construction of the Segundo Services Center.