

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS
IN CONNECTION WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION
OF VETERINARY MEDICINE 3B,
DAVIS CAMPUS**

I. CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL EIR

Pursuant to Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 15090(a), the Board of Regents of the University of California (The Regents) (hereinafter referred to collectively as “The University”), as lead agency, hereby certifies that the Focused Tiered Environmental Impact Report (FTEIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 2007032123) for the proposed Veterinary Medicine 3B project (the project) has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq. (CEQA). The University further finds that it reviewed and considered the information contained in the FTEIR, and any comments on these documents, prior to approving the design of the project. The University hereby finds that the FTEIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the University regarding the environmental impacts of the Veterinary Medicine 3B project.

II. FINDINGS

The University hereby adopts the following Findings pursuant to Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 15090, in conjunction with the approval of the project, which is set forth in Section III, below.

A. Background

UC Davis proposes to construct and operate the Veterinary Medicine 3B project. The project would consist of an approximately 125,000 gross square foot (gsf) (approximately 77,000 assignable square foot (asf)) four-story building encompassing: offices and workspace; research laboratories and laboratory support space, which includes approximately 495 asf of biosafety level 3 laboratory space; rodent vivarium space; and centralized research support space, which could be used as future rodent vivarium expansion space. The proposed project would not increase the campus population, and would relocate existing members of the campus population from Surge 3 and Haring Hall in the core of campus to the Health Sciences District. The project would be located in the Health Sciences District of the central campus, adjacent to Parking Lot 50 and the Veterinary Medicine Teaching Hospital, west of Garrod Drive, and south of Hutchison Drive. The project would be designed to allow for a possible realignment of Garrod Drive approximately 250 feet north of the current alignment, and to allow for a possible bicycle crossing at a realigned Garrod Drive. Construction is anticipated to start in fall 2008 and last approximately two years. The construction timing for the realignment of Garrod Drive is uncertain and depends upon funding.

B. Environmental Review Process

UC Davis prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and issued a Tiered Initial Study (State Clearinghouse No. 2007032123) for this project on March 23, 2007, in accordance with CEQA and the University of California Procedures for Implementation of CEQA (see Appendix A of the Draft EIR).

The Initial Study for the project, 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. CEQA Guidelines Section 15152 allows for the tiering of environmental analysis from other EIRs. Tiering is appropriate when an EIR has been prepared for a program or plan, and a subsequent project would be consistent with the program or plan.

The project is 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 Initial Study for the project 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 Tiered Initial Study is to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the project 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 Tiered Initial Study analyzed the potential impacts of the project and the adequacy of the existing environmental analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR with regard to 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 Tiered IS prepared for the proposed project, it has been determined that the project, with mitigation, would not result in any new potentially significant impacts or impacts that were not sufficiently addressed and mitigated to the extent feasible by the 2003 LRDP EIR. The Initial Study identified five potential impacts related to Air Quality, Cultural Resources, and Hydrology resources areas that the 2003 LRDP EIR identified as significant and unavoidable to which the proposed project may

contribute. UC Davis prepared a Draft Focused Tiered EIR to re-evaluate those five impacts to determine whether there is any additional project-specific mitigation or alternatives to the proposed project that would eliminate or reduce the project's contribution to those impacts.

The NOP and Tiered Initial Study were submitted to the State Clearinghouse in the Governor's Office of Planning and Research and circulated for a 30-day public review period beginning on March 23, 2007 and concluding on April 23, 2007. During that time, the document was available for review by various state and local agencies, as well as by interested individuals and organizations. One letter was received during the comment period from the Department of Water Resources commenting upon a possible requirement for a flood plain encroachment permit to reconfigure existing stormwater drains. The comment from the Department of Water Resources resulted in no changes to the Initial Study. A response to the comment can be found in Appendix B of the Draft FTEIR. In addition, a public scoping meeting was held on May 17, 2007 to receive additional comments on the scope of the EIR. No comments were provided at this meeting. The Draft FTEIR was circulated for a 45-day public and agency review period from May 7, 2007 to June 21, 2007. No comment letters were received on the Draft FTEIR.

After the public scoping period, the proposed site plan for the Veterinary Medicine 3B project was modified slightly to reconfigure the proposed bike path and crossing and provide additional traffic calming on the road which the bike path would cross. The modified site plan was incorporated into the Draft FTEIR, but did not affect the analysis originally presented in the Tiered Initial Study. No new or increased impacts were identified as a result of this change to the site plan.

The Focused Tiered Environmental Impact Report (FTEIR) for the Veterinary Medicine 3B project is comprised of the Tiered Initial Study (TIS), the Notice of Preparation (NOP), the Draft Focused Tiered Environmental Impact Report (Draft FTEIR), the Response to Comments, and the Final Focused Tiered Environmental Impact Report (Final FTEIR). The FTEIR incorporates by reference all of these documents, as well as the 2003 Long Range Development Plan (2003 LRDP), the 2003 LRDP EIR, and the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the 2003 LRDP.

The University found that the project may incrementally contribute to, but would not exceed, significant environmental impacts previously identified in the 2003 LRDP. The FTEIR further concluded that the impacts of growth pursuant to the 2003 LRDP, including the proposed project, were adequately addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and that the project will not result in any new impacts or increase the severity of any previously identified impacts. The FTEIR did not identify any new information or change in circumstances that would require further analysis pursuant to Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines.

C. Relation of the Project 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 project and cumulative impacts associated with that growth. The project would not result in any increase to the campus population, and accordingly, would not exceed the population increase projected in the 2003 LRDP EIR. Additionally, the proposed project is consistent with and is part of the campus development that was anticipated in the 2003 LRDP and evaluated in the 2003 LRDP EIR.

The Initial Study for the project was tiered from the 2003 LRDP EIR in accordance with Sections 15152 and 15168(d) of the CEQA Guidelines and Public Resources Code Section 21094. As discussed above in Section B, based on the analysis in the TIS, a Focused Tiered EIR was prepared for the Veterinary Medicine 3B project. Based on the analysis presented in the FTEIR, the 2003 LRDP mitigation measures already being implemented will substantially lessen or avoid many significant project-specific environmental effects. For the significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the areas of Air Quality, Cultural Resources and Hydrology, the 2003 LRDP mitigation measures will lessen the contribution to those impacts resulting from the Veterinary Medicine 3B project; however, the impacts will remain significant and unavoidable after all feasible mitigation has been implemented. The FTEIR did not identify any project-specific mitigation measures that could further reduce these significant and unavoidable impacts.

D. Environmental Summary

The following sections summarize the environmental evaluation provided in the Focused Tiered Environmental Impact Report for the proposed project.

1. Significant and Unavoidable Adverse Impacts Associated with the 2003 LRDP and Related Mitigation Measures

The FTEIR for the project recognized significant and unavoidable adverse impacts associated with implementation of the 2003 LRDP, including the project, and identified related mitigation measures. All of these significant and unavoidable impacts that are discussed below were adequately analyzed in the FTEIR and are fully addressed in these Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations. Most of the significant and unavoidable adverse impacts identified in the FTEIR relate to cumulative development. The FTEIR evaluated the impact of cumulative development, defined by the CEQA Guidelines as "the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects" (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15355(b)). The cumulative impact analysis in the FTEIR analyzed the proposed project combined with growth allowed under the 2003 LRDP and growth anticipated in the region. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the FTEIR used a "plan" approach as a framework for its cumulative impact analysis which is based on a "summary of projections contained in an adopted

general plan or related planning document which is designed to evaluate regional or area-wide conditions" (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15130(b)).

Because the project implements a portion of the 2003 LRDP, the cumulative impact analysis in the FTEIR relies on the 2003 LRDP EIR, which includes an analysis of campus development projected through 2015-16 in the 2003 LRDP and related cumulative development in the campus vicinity. The cumulative impact analysis from the 2003 LRDP EIR is incorporated by reference in the FTEIR pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15130(d).

The FTEIR did not identify any project-specific significant impacts, but did recognize that the project would contribute to several significant and unavoidable adverse impacts associated with the implementation of the 2003 LRDP. The 2003 LRDP EIR identified mitigation measures that would reduce to the extent feasible, but not avoid, these significant and unavoidable adverse impacts. These mitigation measures were adopted as part of the approval of the 2003 LRDP and are currently being implemented. The FTEIR did not identify any additional project-specific mitigation measures that would further reduce or avoid these impacts. All of these significant and unavoidable impacts, discussed below in Finding II.D, were adequately addressed in the FTEIR and reviewed in these Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations. 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures are also identified and briefly discussed below. For a detailed description of these mitigation measures, please see the text in the Initial Study, which can be found in Appendix A of the Draft FTEIR.

a. Cumulative impacts on aesthetics from changes in overall visual character (LRDP Impact 4.1-5).

The proposed project, as part of the overall campus growth pursuant to the 2003 LRDP, would contribute to overall changes to visual character. The FTEIR identified significant and unavoidable adverse cumulative impacts associated with changes to visual character. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.1-2 (a-b) (new structures, roads, and landscaping shall be designed to be compatible with the 2003 LRDP visual elements and policies, and the Campus Design Review Committee must determine that project designs are consistent with the 2003 LRDP policies) and 4.1-5 (a-b) (implement Mitigation Measure 4.1-2(a-b) and surrounding local jurisdictions can and should implement policies that support the protection of visual quality) would reduce impacts on visual character. While these measures would reduce the magnitude of this cumulative impact, it is considered significant and unavoidable. The FTEIR did not identify any additional project-specific mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to this impact. While the 2003 LRDP mitigation measures would reduce the magnitude of this cumulative impact, it is still considered significant and unavoidable.

The University finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this unavoidable environmental impact of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.F of these Findings.

b. Cumulative impacts on aesthetics from increased light and glare (LRDP Impact 4.1-6).

The proposed project, as part of the overall campus growth pursuant to the 2003 LRDP, would contribute to increased light and glare. The FTEIR identified significant and unavoidable adverse cumulative impacts associated with increased light sources that would create new sources of light and glare that could adversely affect daytime and nighttime views. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.1-3 (a-c) (design shall use non-reflective exterior surfaces and glass, use shielded and cutoff type light fixtures for outdoor lighting, and any use of non-cutoff, non-shielded lighting fixtures shall require review by the Campus Design Review Committee to ensure that a minimum amount of such lighting needed to achieve the desired nighttime emphasis and that such lighting creates no adverse effect on nighttime views) and 4.1-6(a-b) (implementation of 4.1-3(a-b) and surrounding jurisdictions should implement standards and guidelines which support minimal use of site lighting) would continue to be implemented and would aid in reducing the potential lighting impact identified in the 2003 LRDP. The FTEIR did not identify any additional project-specific mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to this impact. While the 2003 LRDP mitigation measures would reduce the magnitude of this cumulative impact, it is still considered significant and unavoidable.

The University finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this unavoidable environmental impact of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.F of these Findings.

c. Impacts on air quality from emissions that exceed YSAQMD Thresholds (LRDP Impacts 4.3-1 and 4.3-3).

The proposed project, as part of the overall campus growth pursuant to the 2003 LRDP, would contribute to increased emissions of criteria pollutants. The FTEIR identified significant and unavoidable adverse impacts associated with increased emissions of criteria pollutants that could contribute to overall operational emissions exceeding the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District Thresholds. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.3-1(a) (requiring the campus to reduce emissions from vehicles), (b) (requiring reduction of emissions from area sources) and (c) (requiring the campus to participate in YSAQMD planning efforts) are continuing to be implemented and will aid in reducing the potential impact to air quality identified in the 2003 LRDP. Previously adopted LRDP Mitigation Measures 4.3-3(a-c) (requiring the campus to reduce emissions from construction activities) are continuing to be implemented and will aid in reducing the potential impact to air quality identified in the 2003 LRDP. Impacts 4.3-1 and 4.3-3 were evaluated in the FTEIR for the project. The FTEIR did not identify any feasible additional project-specific mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to these impacts. While the 2003 LRDP mitigation measures would reduce the magnitude of both of these impacts, they are both still considered significant and unavoidable.

The University finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this unavoidable environmental impact of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.F of these Findings.

d. Cumulative impacts on air quality from emissions that exceed YSAQMD Thresholds (LRDP Impact 4.3-6).

The proposed project, as part of the overall campus growth pursuant to the 2003 LRDP, would contribute to emissions of non-attainment pollutants. The FTEIR identified significant and unavoidable adverse cumulative impacts associated with a cumulatively considerable increase of non-attainment pollutants. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-6 (requiring the campus to implement Measure 4.3-1(a-c), described in the above item II.D.1.c) would continue to be implemented and would aid in reducing emissions. The FTEIR did not identify any additional project-specific mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to this impact. While the 2003 LRDP mitigation measures would reduce the magnitude of this cumulative impact, it is still considered significant and unavoidable.

The University finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this unavoidable environmental impact of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.F of these Findings.

e. Cumulative loss of habitat for Swainson's hawk and burrowing owl (LRDP Impact 4.4-12).

The proposed project, as part of the overall campus growth pursuant to the 2003 LRDP, would contribute to the loss of ruderal annual grassland that provides habitat for Swainson's hawk and burrowing owl. The FTEIR identified significant and unavoidable adverse impacts associated with cumulative loss of habitat for Swainson's hawk and burrowing owl. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-12 (implement Mitigation 4.4-1(a-c), 4.4-2(a-b), 4.4-3(a-b), and 4.4-7) would preserve habitat, which would reduce LRDP impacts to less than significant. However, cumulative loss of agricultural land in the region is irreversible and was determined to be a cumulatively significant impact. The University finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this unavoidable environmental impact of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.F of these Findings.

f. Impacts on archaeological resources (LRDP Impact 4.5-3).

The proposed project, as part of the overall campus growth pursuant to the 2003 LRDP, could contribute to potential changes to archaeological resources. The FTEIR identified significant and unavoidable adverse impacts associated with a substantial adverse change to historical or archaeological resources on the project site. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.5-1 through 4.5-5 (requiring the campus to evaluate project sites for archaeological resources and protect discovered resources; to take appropriate steps to minimize the potential

for such disturbance and; if disturbance occurs, to follow all requirements to protect the human remains and complete the proper reinterment procedures) would continue to be implemented and would aid in reducing disturbance to archaeological resources. The campus would prefer to preserve significant resources where possible; however, because there may be cases in which avoidance or preservation of such a resource is not feasible, this project-level impact is considered significant and unavoidable. Impact 4.5-3 was evaluated in the FTEIR for the project. The FTEIR did not identify any additional project-specific mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to this impact. While the 2003 LRDP mitigation measures would reduce the magnitude of this impact, it is still considered significant and unavoidable.

The University finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this unavoidable environmental impact of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.F of these Findings.

g. Cumulative impacts on archaeological resources (LRDP Impact 4.5-5).

The proposed project, as part of the overall campus growth pursuant to the 2003 LRDP, could contribute to disturbance of archaeological resources. The FTEIR identified significant and unavoidable adverse cumulative impacts associated with disturbance to archaeological resources in the region. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.5-1 through 4.5-5 (as described in the above item II.D.1.e) would still be implemented and would aid in reducing disturbance to archaeological resources. The FTEIR did not identify any additional project-specific mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to this impact. While the 2003 LRDP mitigation measures would reduce the magnitude of this cumulative impact, it is still considered significant and unavoidable.

The University finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this unavoidable environmental impact of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.F of these Findings.

h. Groundwater impacts associated with increase in withdrawals from the deep and shallow/intermediate aquifers (LRDP Impacts 4.8-5 and 4.8-6)

The proposed project, as part of the overall campus growth pursuant to the 2003 LRDP, would contribute to the demand for water from the deep and the shallow/intermediate aquifers and would increase the amount of impermeable surfaces which could substantially interfere with recharge of both the deep and shallow/intermediate aquifers. The FTEIR identified significant and unavoidable adverse project level impacts associated with increased withdrawals from the deep and shallow/intermediate aquifers. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.8-5(b, d) and 4.8-6 (a-e) would require continued water conservation efforts, efforts to determine the ability of the both aquifers to provide for the campus' long-term water needs,

efforts to minimize withdrawals by UC Davis and the City of Davis from the same deep aquifer, monitoring of both aquifers, and identification of alternative water sources, including surface water and recycled water. Regardless of these mitigation measures, UC Davis' future demand for water could reduce groundwater levels in one or both of these aquifers, contributing to a net deficit in the overall groundwater budget. Previously adopted LRDP Mitigation Measures 4.8-13 (a, b) and 4.8-14 (a, b) address cumulative withdrawals associated with both campus and City of Davis water demand. However, the combined effects are not well understood, and could result in a long term reduction in groundwater levels. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable on a project level. Impacts 4.8-5 and 4.8-6 were evaluated in the FTEIR for the project. The FTEIR did not identify any additional project-specific mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to these impacts. While the 2003 LRDP mitigation measures would reduce the magnitude of these impacts, they are still considered significant and unavoidable.

The University finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this unavoidable environmental impact of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.F of these Findings.

i. Cumulative impacts on water quality associated with increased impervious surface resulting in increased storm water runoff (LRDP Impact 4.8-10)

The proposed project, as part of the overall campus growth pursuant to the 2003 LRDP, would contribute to increased storm water runoff. The FTEIR identified significant and unavoidable adverse cumulative impacts associated with impacts on water quality associated with increased impervious surface resulting in increased storm water runoff. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.8-10 (a-c) requires the campus and regional jurisdictions to comply with NPDES Phase II requirements and implement SWPPPs for specified industrial and construction activities. However, implementation of LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.8-10(b) and (c) cannot be guaranteed by the University of California because it falls within other jurisdictions to enforce and monitor. Therefore, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable. The FTEIR did not identify any additional project-specific mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to this impact. While the 2003 LRDP mitigation measures would reduce the magnitude of this cumulative impact, it is still considered significant and unavoidable.

The University finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this unavoidable environmental impact of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.F of these Findings.

j. Groundwater impacts associated with increase in withdrawals from the deep and shallow/intermediate aquifers (LRDP Impacts 4.8-13 and 4.8-14)

The proposed project, as part of the overall campus growth pursuant to the 2003 LRDP, would contribute to the demand for water from the deep and the shallow/intermediate aquifers and would increase the amount of impermeable surfaces which could substantially interfere with recharge of both the deep and shallow/intermediate aquifers. The FTEIR identified significant and unavoidable adverse cumulative impacts associated with increased withdrawals from the deep and shallow/intermediate aquifers. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.8-5(b, d) and 4.8-6 (a-e) would require continued water conservation efforts, efforts to determine the ability of the both aquifers to provide for the campus' long-term water needs, efforts to minimize withdrawals by UC Davis and the City of Davis from the same deep aquifer, monitoring of both aquifers, and identification of alternative water sources, including surface water and recycled water. Regardless of these mitigation measures, UC Davis' future demand for water could reduce groundwater levels in one or both of these aquifers, contributing to a net deficit in the overall groundwater budget. Previously adopted LRDP Mitigation Measures 4.8-13 (a, b) and 4.8-14 (a, b) address cumulative withdrawals associated with both campus and City of Davis water demand. However, the combined effects are not well understood, and could result in a long term reduction in groundwater levels. Therefore, these impacts are considered significant and unavoidable on a cumulative level. The FTEIR did not identify any additional project-specific mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to this impact. While the 2003 LRDP mitigation measures would reduce the magnitude of these cumulative impacts, they are still considered significant and unavoidable.

The University finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this unavoidable environmental impact of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.F of these Findings.

k. Cumulative increases in ambient noise levels associated with regional development (LRDP Impact 4.10-5)

The proposed project, as part of the overall campus growth pursuant to the 2003 LRDP, would contribute to increased noise levels. The FTEIR identified a significant and unavoidable adverse cumulative impact associated with increased regional development and, therefore, ambient noise levels. 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.10-1 would address this impact by requiring specific construction noise abatement and noise control programs on campus. However, the campus cannot ensure that noise abatement and control programs would be implemented by the City of Davis and other regional entities, and it is uncertain whether this measure would effectively reduce noise to acceptable levels. Therefore, the impact would still be considered significant and unavoidable. The FTEIR did not identify any additional project-specific mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen the project's contribution to this cumulative impact. While the 2003 LRDP mitigation measures would reduce the magnitude of this cumulative impact, it is still considered significant and unavoidable.

The University finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this unavoidable environmental impact of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.F of these Findings.

2. **Significant and Potentially Significant Impacts that would be Mitigated to "Less-than-Significant" Levels and Related Mitigation Measures**

The FTEIR identifies the following significant and potentially significant impacts associated with the project that would be reduced to "less-than-significant" levels by the continued implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP mitigation measures. The impacts resulting from the project would be no greater than the level of impacts described in the 2003 LRDP EIR and the impacts of the proposed project were included within the analysis of the overall development in the 2003 LRDP EIR. The associated mitigation measures are identified and briefly discussed below. For a detailed description of these mitigation measures, please see the text in the FTEIR.

a. **Development under the 2003 LRDP could degrade the visual character of the campus by substantially degrading the valued elements of the visual landscape identified in the 2003 LRDP (LRDP Impact 4.1-2)**

The project would contribute to changes in the visual character of the campus. Campus development allowed under the 2003 LRDP could degrade the visual character of the campus. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.1-2 (a-b) requires the campus to design the project to be compatible with the visual elements and policies identified in the 2003 LRDP, and for project design to be reviewed by the Campus Design Review Committee for consistency with those elements and policies, applicable planning guidelines, and the character of the surrounding development. The campus continues to implement this mitigation measure when needed to avoid adversely impacting visual character of the campus. Implementation of the mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

b. **Development under the 2003 LRDP could create substantial light and glare on campus that could adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area (LRDP Impact 4.1-3)**

The proposed project design calls for glass and lighting to be used in the building, which would result in additional glare and nighttime lighting on the campus. Outdoor lighting installed as part of the project would use directional lighting methods to minimize glare and upward directed light. Campus development allowed under the 2003 LRDP could create substantial light or glare that could adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.1-3 (b)-(c) requires the campus to utilize directional lighting methods with shielded and cutoff type light fixtures, and to require review of any non-directional

lighting elements by the Campus Design Review Committee. The campus continues to implement this mitigation measure when needed to avoid adversely impacting daytime or nighttime views in the area. Implementation of the mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

c. Regional growth could result in an increase in toxic air contaminants (LRDP Impact 4.3-8).

The project would contribute to a regional increase in toxic air contaminants. Growth from the 2003 LRDP, in combination with expected regional growth, could result in a cumulatively considerable increase of toxic air contaminants which could expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations. Previously adopted LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.3-8 (requiring the campus to monitor new regulations and programs from responsible regulating agencies and implement appropriate changes on campus) would be implemented and would aid in reducing toxic air contaminants (TAC) impacts to a less-than-significant level. Because the responsible regulating agencies (California Air Resources Board (CARB), Federal Environmental Protection Agency) are giving priority to air toxics regulation, there are reduction programs under development and/or in effect, and technologies are available to achieve substantial additional TAC reductions, CARB's projections of continuing regional TAC reductions are well supported, resulting in a less-than-significant cumulative impact.

d. Development under the 2003 LRDP could result in the loss of habitat and disruption of nesting efforts and the loss of active nest sites for Swainson's hawks or other birds of prey, or burrowing owls (LRDP Impacts 4.4-2, 4.4-3, 4.4-4 and 4.4-5)

Swainson's hawks have not nested on the project site, but they have nested within ½ mile of the project site. Campus development allowed under the 2003 LRDP could disrupt nesting efforts or result in the loss of active nest sites for Swainson's hawk. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measures 4.4-4 (a-b) and 4.4-5 require the campus to preserve agricultural land and conduct pre-construction and annual surveys for nesting birds, to take feasible action if potential disturbance to nesting raptors is identified, and to allow the campus to minimize the potential impact. The campus continues to implement this mitigation measure when needed to ensure adequate protection of nesting efforts by Swainson's hawks and other birds of prey. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

The project would result in loss of ruderal annual grassland that could serve as foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk and nesting habitat for burrowing owls. Campus development allowed under the 2003 LRDP could disrupt nesting efforts or result in the loss of active nest sites for Swainson's hawk. Swainson's hawks have not nested on the project site, but they have nested within ½ mile of the project site. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measures 4.4-2, 4.4-3(a-d), 4.4-4 (a-b), and 4.4-5 require the campus to establish mitigation lands to mitigate the loss of foraging habitat; and to conduct pre-construction and annual surveys for nesting birds, to

take feasible action if potential disturbance to nesting raptors is identified, and to allow the campus to minimize the potential impact. The campus continues to implement these mitigation measures when needed to ensure adequate protection of nesting efforts by Swainson's hawks and other birds of prey and burrowing owls. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level.

e. Development under the 2003 LRDP could result in the removal of specimen trees (LRDP Impact 4.4-11)

The project is being designed to protect in place or relocate the trees on-site that were identified as specimen trees. Campus development allowed under the LRDP could result in removal of important trees. In accordance with previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.4-11, a tree survey of the project site was conducted to identify heritage and specimen trees, and no heritage trees were identified on the project site. Implementation of the mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

f. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could damage, destroy or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource or historic building or structure as the result of grading, excavation, ground disturbance or other project development (LRDP Impacts 4.5-1 and 4.5-2).

The project does not have any historic buildings on the proposed site, and an archaeological survey was conducted for the site, with no cultural resource finds during testing; however, the project would require excavation and grading and could result in damage, destruction, or substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources undiscovered during survey testing. Campus development allowed under the 2003 LRDP could disrupt, damage or destroy archaeological resources. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measures 4.5-1 (a)-(b) and 4.5-2 require the campus to evaluate project sites for archaeological resources and protect discovered resources. The campus continues to implement these mitigation measures when needed to ensure adequate protection of archaeological resources. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

g. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries (LRDP Impact 4.5-4).

An archaeological survey was conducted for the site, with no cultural resource finds during testing; however, the project would require excavation and grading and could result in disturbance of human remains undiscovered during survey testing. Campus development allowed under the 2003 LRDP could result in disturbance of human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.5-4 (a, b) requires the campus to take appropriate steps to minimize the potential for such disturbance and, if disturbance occurs, to follow all requirements to protect the human remains

and complete the proper reinterment procedures. The campus continues to implement this mitigation measure during project planning and construction. Implementation of the mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

h. Campus development under the 2003 LRDP could physically interfere with the campus Emergency Operations Plan (LRDP Impact 4.7-17).

The project would require periodic road lane closures during construction. Campus development allowed under the 2003 LRDP could physically interfere with the campus Emergency Operations Plan. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.7-17 requires the campus to either maintain existing access routes for emergency vehicles or provide suitable construction related detours for emergency vehicles. The campus continues to implement this mitigation measure when needed to ensure adequate emergency vehicle access for the campus. Implementation of the mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

i. Campus development under the 2003 LRDP would increase impervious surfaces on the campus and could alter drainage patterns, thereby increasing runoff and loads of pollution in storm water, which could affect water quality (LRDP Impact 4.8-2).

The project would construct approximately 1.25 acres of impervious surfaces. Campus development allowed under the 2003 LRDP would increase stormwater runoff and pollution. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.8-2 requires the campus to comply with storm water management plan measures to minimize additional pollutants. The campus continues to implement this mitigation measure when needed so that storm water pollution effects are minimized. Implementation of the mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

j. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP in combination with regional development could alter drainage patterns in the project area and increase impervious surfaces, which could exceed the capacity of storm water drainage systems and result in localized flooding and contribution to offsite flooding (LRDP Impacts 4.8-3 and 4.8-11).

The project would construct approximately 1.25 acres of impervious surfaces. Campus development allowed under the 2003 LRDP in combination with regional development would increase impervious surfaces which could result in runoff exceeding the capacity of storm drainage systems. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.8-3 (a, b) requires the campus to perform storm drainage studies for each new development and design and implement any needed improvements. The campus continues to implement this mitigation measure when needed so that flooding effects are minimized. Implementation of the mitigation measure would reduce both project and cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level.

- k. Campus growth under the 2003 LRDP in combination with regional development would increase discharge of treated effluent from the campus wastewater treatment plant into the South Fork of Putah Creek, which could exceed waste discharge requirements and degrade receiving water quality. (LRDP Impacts 4.8-4 and 4.8-12).**

The project would construct wet labs and restrooms and could result in a slight increase in effluent. Campus development allowed under the 2003 LRDP in combination with regional development would increase discharge of treated effluent which could degrade receiving water quality. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.8-4 (a, b) requires the campus to continue to monitor and modify its pretreatment program, Wastewater Treatment Plant operation, and/or treatment processes as necessary to comply with waste discharge requirements. The campus continues to implement this mitigation measure so that water quality effects of discharge are minimized. Implementation of the mitigation measure would reduce both project and cumulative impacts to a less-than-significant level.

- l. Construction of campus facilities under the 2003 LRDP could expose nearby receptors to excessive groundborne vibration and airborne or groundborne noise (LRDP Impact 4.10-1).**

Noise from construction of the proposed project would be audible and would temporarily elevate the local ambient noise level. Campus development allowed under the 2003 LRDP could increase the potential for noise impacts near construction sites. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.10-1 requires the campus to enact a construction noise mitigation program to minimize the effects of construction noise. The campus continues to implement this mitigation measure when needed so that the effects of construction noise are minimized. Implementation of the mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

- m. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would result in unacceptable intersection operations at on-campus intersections (LRDP Impact 4.14-1).**

The project could result in changes to intersection operations at on-campus intersections based on different on-campus travel patterns, but it is anticipated that overall trips would not increase. Campus development allowed under the 2003 LRDP would increase traffic and could increase the potential for unacceptable operation of on-campus intersections. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measures 4.14-1(a-c) and 4.14-2 (a-c) require the campus to continue to pursue Transportation Demand Management strategies to reduce vehicle-trips, monitor peak hour traffic operations at critical locations, and review individual projects to determine if operations will degrade to unacceptable levels. The campus continues to implement these mitigation measures when needed so that the traffic impacts are minimized. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

n. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would create additional parking demand (LRDP Impact 4.14-3).

The proposed project would not add to the campus population, but it would relocate members of the campus population from the core campus to the Health Sciences District, which could result in changes in parking patterns on campus. Campus development allowed under the 2003 LRDP would create demand for parking. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.14-3(a-b) requires the campus to continue to pursue Transportation Demand Management strategies to reduce parking demand, and provide additional parking as needed. The campus continues to implement this mitigation measure when needed so that the traffic impacts are minimized. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

o. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would create increase demand for transit services (LRDP Impact 4.14-4).

The project would relocate members of the campus population to the Health Sciences District, and that could contribute to added demand for intercampus transit. Campus development allowed under the 2003 LRDP would create demand for transit services. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.14-4 requires the campus to continue to provide additional transit services or new transit routes as needed. The campus continues to implement this mitigation measure when needed so that the traffic impacts are minimized. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

p. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would result in increased conflicts between bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit vehicles (LRDP Impact 4.14-5).

The project would include a possible future realignment of Garrod Drive and a possible future new bicycle crossing; appropriate safety controls would be designed into both elements to minimize traffic hazards. Growth in population levels in the core area of the central campus associated with campus development allowed under the 2003 LRDP, including operation of the proposed project, would result in increased conflicts between bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit vehicles, causing increased congestion and safety problems. Previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.14-5 requires the campus to continue to monitor core area pedestrian and bike activity and accidents, and to improve bike and pedestrian facilities or alter transit operations to avoid increased bicycle accident rates or safety problems. The campus continues to implement this mitigation measure when needed so that the transportation impacts are minimized. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

3. **Less-than-Significant Impacts for which Mitigation Measures Have Been Incorporated and Related Mitigation Measures**

The FTEIR identified the following less-than-significant impacts for which 2003 LRDP mitigation measures have been incorporated as part of the project. Mitigation to further reduce less-than-significant impacts is not required by CEQA. The impacts resulting from the project would be no greater than the level of impacts described in the 2003 LRDP EIR and the impacts of the proposed project were included within the analysis of the overall development in the 2003 LRDP EIR. The mitigation measures identified below are presented in summary form. For a detailed description of these measures, please see the FTEIR.

- a. **Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase routine hazardous chemical use on campus by UC Davis laboratories and departments and in maintenance and support operations, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment (LRDP Impact 4.7-1).**

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would include use of building construction and cleaning materials, which would not expose employees or campus occupants to significant levels of potentially hazardous materials. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to be less-than-significant because of the low hazard risk to the public and to the environment. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.7-1 (implementation of chemical safety plans and programs) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

- b. **Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could increase routine generation of hazardous wastes on campus by UC Davis laboratories and departments and from maintenance and support operations, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment (LRDP Impact 4.7-2).**

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would include use of building construction and cleaning materials, which would not expose employees or campus occupants to significant levels of potentially hazardous materials. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to be less-than-significant because of the low hazard risk to the public and to the environment. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, continued implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 (a and b) (continued implementation of chemical safety plans and programs and continued implementation of hazardous waste management programs) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

- c. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could increase routine generation of radioactive materials on campus by UC Davis laboratories, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment. (LRDP Impact 4.7-3).**

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would increase routine generation of radioactive materials on campus. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to be less-than-significant because of the low hazard risk to the public and to the environment. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, continued implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.7-3 (a and b) (continued implementation of hazardous materials plans and programs and continued implementation of radioactive materials programs) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

- d. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could increase routine generation of radioactive wastes on campus by UC Davis laboratories, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment (LRDP Impact 4.7-4).**

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would increase routine generation of radioactive wastes on campus. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to be less-than-significant because of the low hazard risk to the public and to the environment. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, continued implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.7-4 (a and b) (continued implementation of safety plans and and radioactive materials programs) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

- e. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could increase routine generation of biohazardous materials on campus by UC Davis laboratories, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment (LRDP Impact 4.7-5).**

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would increase routine generation of biohazardous materials on campus. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to be less-than-significant because of the low hazard risk to the public and to the environment. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, continued implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.7-5 (a and b) (continued implementation of biohazard safety plans and programs and continued implementation of biosafety programs) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

f. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could increase routine generation of biohazardous wastes on campus by UC Davis laboratories, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment (LRDP Impact 4.7-6).

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would increase routine generation of biohazardous wastes on campus. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to be less-than-significant because of the low hazard risk to the public and to the environment. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, continued implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.7-6 (a and b) (continued implementation of safety plans and and biosafety programs) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

g. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could increase routine use of laboratory animals on campus by UC Davis laboratories, which would not create significantly increase risk of animal bites, escapes, and disease transmission.

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would increase routine use of laboratory animals on campus. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to be less-than-significant because of the low hazard risk to the public and to the environment. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, continued implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.7-2 (a, b, and c) (continued implementation of safety plans and biosafety programs and continued programs related to the care and handling of laboratory animals) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

h. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase the routine transport of hazardous materials to and from campus, which would not significantly increase hazards to the public or the environment (LRDP Impact 4.7-8).

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would include transport of building construction and cleaning materials to and from the project site, which would not expose employees or campus occupants to significant levels of potentially hazardous materials. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to be less-than-significant because of the low hazard risk to the public and to the environment. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, continued implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.7-8 (continued implementation of requirement to transport chemicals on public roads in conformance with all legal transportation requirements) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

- i. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not create a significant hazard to the public or to the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment (LRDP Impact 4.7-9).**

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would include use and transport of building construction and cleaning materials to and from the project site, which would not expose employees or campus occupants to significant levels of potentially hazardous materials. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to be less-than-significant because of the low hazard risk to the public and to the environment. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.7-9 (standard practices for storage and transportation of hazardous materials) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

- j. Construction activities on campus under the 2003 LRDP would not expose construction workers or campus occupants to contaminated soils or groundwater (LRDP Impact 4.7-12).**

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would include ground-disturbing construction activities which could expose construction workers or campus occupants to contaminated soils or groundwater. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to be less-than-significant because of the low hazard risk. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, continued implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.7-12 (performance of due diligence assessments of sites where ground-disturbing construction is proposed) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

- k. Campus construction activities associated with implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not contribute substantial loads of sediment or other pollutants in storm water runoff that could degrade receiving water quality (LRDP Impact 4.8-1).**

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would contribute to sediment in stormwater runoff. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to be less-than-significant because the campus will continue to implement erosion control measures to eliminate or reduce non-storm and storm water discharges to receiving waters. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.8-1 (implementation of erosion control for construction projects) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

l. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of campus domestic/fire water extraction and conveyance systems, which would not cause significant environmental impacts (LRDP Impact 4.15-1).

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would contribute to the potential future expansion of the campus domestic/fire water extraction and conveyance systems. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to be less-than-significant because of the multiple options available for completing system improvements. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, continued implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.15-1 (a and b) (conducting utility assessments prior to connecting new projects and implementing conservation strategies) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

m. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of campus utility water extraction and conveyance systems, which would not cause significant environmental impacts (LRDP Impact 4.15-2).

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would contribute to the potential future expansion of the campus utility water extraction and conveyance facilities. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to be less-than-significant because of the multiple options available for completing system improvements and the relatively small construction activities that would be required to complete the system improvements. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, continued implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.15-2 (a and b) (conducting supply assessments prior to connecting new projects and implementing water conservation strategies) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

n. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of wastewater treatment and conveyance facilities, the construction and operation of which would not result in significant environmental impacts (LRDP Impact 4.15-3).

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would contribute to the potential future expansion of the campus wastewater treatment and conveyance facilities. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to be less-than-significant because of the multiple options available for completing system improvements. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, continued implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.15-3 (conducting utility assessments prior to connecting new projects) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

- o. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of campus storm water drainage conveyance and detention facilities, which would not result in significant environmental impacts (LRDP Impact 4.15-4).**

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would contribute to the potential future expansion of the campus storm drainage conveyance and retention facilities. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to be less-than-significant because of the multiple options available for completing system improvements. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, continued implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.15-4 (conducting utility assessments prior to connecting new projects) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

- p. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of the campus electrical system, which would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts (LRDP Impact 4.15-6).**

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would contribute to the potential future expansion of the campus electrical system. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to be less-than-significant because of the multiple options available for completing system improvements. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, continued implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.15-6 (a and b) (conducting utility assessments prior to connecting new projects and implementing conservation measures) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

- q. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of campus chilled water and steam generation and conveyance facilities, which would not result in significant environmental impacts (LRDP Impact 4.15-8).**

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would contribute to the potential future expansion of the campus chilled water and steam generation and conveyance facilities. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to be less-than-significant because of the multiple options available for completing system improvements. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, continued implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.15-8 (conducting utility assessments prior to connecting new projects) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

- r. Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require expansion of campus communication facilities, which would not result in significant environmental impacts (LRDP Impact 4.15-9).**

The project, as part of growth under the 2003 LRDP, would contribute to the potential future expansion of the campus communication facilities. This impact was determined in the FTEIR to

be less-than-significant because of the multiple options available for completing system improvements. The impact continues to be less-than-significant and, although not required, continued implementation of previously adopted 2003 LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.15-9 (conducting utility assessments prior to connecting new projects) will continue to further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

E. Additional Findings

1. Incorporation by Reference

These Findings incorporate by reference in their entirety the text of the Focused Tiered EIR for the project; 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 no project-specific mitigation measures and accordingly, no mitigation monitoring program is required for the project. The campus continues to implement the mitigation measures contained in the 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Monitoring Program. All relevant 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures identified in the FTEIR 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.

4. Alternatives

The FTEIR evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed Veterinary Medicine 3B project in Section 6 of the Draft FTEIR. In compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines,

the alternatives analysis also included an analysis of a No Project Alternative and identified the environmentally superior alternative. The Draft FTEIR examined each alternative's feasibility and ability to meet most of the project objectives (as articulated in Section 3.4 of the Draft FTEIR). Those that clearly were found to be infeasible were rejected without further environmental review. Alternatives that might have been feasible and that would attain most of the project objectives were carried forward and analyzed with regard to whether they would reduce or avoid significant impacts of the project. The alternatives considered but rejected included: Construction at Non-UC Davis Location; Utilize Research Facilities at Other Institutions of Higher Education; and Lease Off-Campus Space. The alternatives considered and evaluated included: No Project – No Build; Renovations Only; and Construction of Reduced Facilities. The University certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on alternatives provided in the Focused Tiered EIR and the record of proceedings. Brief summaries of the evaluated alternatives are given below:

a. No Project – No Build

The project would not be constructed. The UC Davis campus would continue to use existing research facilities and would make no modifications to the existing facilities but would attempt to conduct as much of the proposed research as possible utilizing existing facilities. This alternative would avoid or substantially reduce significant environmental impacts related to the project. This alternative would not meet the basic project objectives: research space would remain inadequate in terms of the amount and quality of space, and inadequate in terms of keeping the School of Veterinary Medicine (SVM) unconsolidated, which would also render the campus unable to fulfill the facilities plan submitted to the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA) for accreditation review and could result in jeopardizing the accreditation of the SVM. The alternative would also result in the continued use of insufficient and outdated research space, and would limit the types and amount of research the School of Veterinary Medicine faculty could conduct, which would also limit faculty in securing grant funding in an increasingly competitive environment. This alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible because it would not attain the basic objectives of the project.

b. Renovations Only

This alternative would seek to upgrade the existing facilities occupied by the SVM, which are outdated for the types of wet lab cellular and molecular biological research conducted by the SVM faculty and researchers currently housed in the facilities. Renovations would attempt to bring the labs and office space up to contemporary standards. An assessment performed in June 2004 estimated the cost of renovating one of the two facilities into modern laboratories and found that the cost for renovations would be significantly higher than the cost of new construction due to the necessity of removing and replacing the interior finishes, mechanical and electrical systems. The assessed facility also has internal block walls that limit effective reconfiguration or consolidation of space. In addition, the level of renovation necessary cannot occur in occupied space, so leased space would have to be secured to move all of the research programs into during the renovation. The Renovations Only alternative would have similar air quality environmental impacts to the proposed project because of the extensive nature of

demolition and construction required to bring the laboratory spaces up to contemporary lab standards. This alternative would likely have considerably less, or even no, hydrologic impact on aquifers, because this alternative would not build an additional facility on campus that required the use of domestic and irrigation water, and would likely retrofit the existing aged buildings to be more water efficient. This alternative would renovate Haring Hall, which is over 50 years old, and renovation could have historic building impacts if Haring Hall were to qualify for the State or National Register. Haring Hall has not been studied for historical significance under National Register significance criteria. This alternative would meet virtually none of the basic project objectives, with the sole exception of providing more modern laboratory space. However, core campus space would not be released to general academic programs, SVM faculty, staff and students would not be consolidated in the Health Sciences District (HSD), and would not complete the facilities plan submitted to the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), potentially jeopardizing the accreditation of the SVM. This alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible because it would not attain the basic objectives of the project.

c. Construction of Reduced Facilities

This alternative would construct a smaller facility in the HSD, capable of housing fewer of the SVM faculty researchers, but still providing at least some of the faculty with improved laboratory conditions and proximity to SVM programs and classrooms already located in the HSD. This alternative would (1) construct a one-story building, of approximately 55,000 gsf, instead of the proposed approximately 124,700 gsf facility, and create approximately 2.5 acres of impervious surface instead of the proposed approximately 1.25 acre footprint of impervious surface; (2) remove all planned space of the proposed facility except for research labs, lab support, and faculty offices; and (3) keep faculty researchers in existing space in the core campus, instead of releasing those buildings' space in the core of campus to accommodate general campus enrollment that has already occurred on the Davis campus. Single-story buildings are generally less complicated and less expensive to build than multiple-story buildings, but they result in far less efficient land use by consuming land disproportionate to multiple-story buildings, resulting in greater sprawl and longer spans of infrastructure to support that sprawling land use. This alternative would have similar environmental impacts to the proposed project, with a possible lower intensity of impacts on air quality because of the reduced scope of construction, but with a higher intensity of impacts on cultural resources because more ground would be disturbed, thereby increasing the possibility of finding archaeological resources, which could be damaged or destroyed by ground-disturbing activities. The overall reduction in operational impacts would lessen the hydrology impacts evaluated in the FTEIR. Overall, the Construction of Reduced Facilities would substantially reduce several environmental effects of the project, but would not overcome the unavoidable impacts on air quality, cultural resources, and hydrology, as construction of a project would still take place. This alternative would entail expenditure of significant amounts of campus capital without meeting project objectives, would continue to lock up sorely needed space in the core campus for general academic programs, and would result in inefficient and unnecessarily consumptive land use patterns in the HSD. This alternative is hereby rejected as infeasible because it would not attain the basic objectives of the project.

d. Environmentally Superior Alternative

The University finds that the Renovations Only alternative should be considered the environmentally superior alternative. As stated above, this alternative would have similar air quality environmental impacts to the proposed project, but would avoid archaeological resources impacts, and would have considerably less hydrologic impacts or possibly even avoid hydrologic impacts. Overall, the Renovations Only alternative would further reduce the significant environmental effects of the project, but would not entirely eliminate them.

F. Statement of Overriding 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 based on the NOP, Initial Study, Draft FTEIR, Final FTEIR, and/or other information in the record. 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. Those Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations are equally relevant to, and are readopted as a part of, this project.

The University has balanced the benefits of the proposed Veterinary Medicine 3B project against the significant and unavoidable adverse environmental effects, discussed in Section II. D. above, in determining that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the project outweigh these adverse environmental effects. The University finds that each of the overriding considerations set forth below constitutes a separate and independent ground for finding that the benefits of the proposed project outweigh its significant adverse environmental impact. This Finding is supported by substantial evidence in the record that includes, but is not limited to, the NOP, Initial Study, Draft FTEIR and Final FTEIR for the proposed project.

Despite the occurrence of significant and unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the additional benefits of and reasons for the approval of the Veterinary Medicine 3B project are as follows:

1. The project implements a portion of the 2003 LRDP and is consistent with the analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR and in the Final EIR.
2. The proposed project would provide laboratory and office space to support biomedical research program in the School of Veterinary Medicine (SVM), sufficient to house approximately 80% of the SVM basic-science faculty, to replace existing facilities that are outdated and inappropriate for the conduct of biomedical research.
3. The project would be located in close proximity to other SVM facilities, and would further consolidate SVM teaching, research, and clinical programs in the Health Sciences District.

4. The project would release space in the core of campus to accommodate general campus enrollment growth that has already occurred on the UC Davis campus.

5. The project would complete the facilities plan submitted to the American Veterinary Medical Association as part of accreditation requirements.

6. There is no other project alternative which would be consistent with the 2003 LRDP and would attain project objectives while avoiding or substantially lessening the significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality, cultural resources, and hydrology.

G. Summary

1. Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, the University has made one or more of the following Findings with respect to the significant environmental effects of the Veterinary Medicine 3B project:

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

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

c. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

2. 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 FTEIR did not identify any additional, feasible, project-specific mitigation measures to mitigate significant impacts to less-than-significant levels.

c. The environmentally superior alternative would lessen, though not entirely avoid, the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project. The environmentally superior alternative is rejected as infeasible because it fails to accomplish the basic project objectives.

d. Any significant impacts to which the project contributes and that are found to be unavoidable were fully analyzed and adequately addressed in the FTEIR and in the 2003 LRDP EIR, and are acceptable due to the factors described and adopted in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section II.F, above.

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

III. APPROVAL

The University hereby takes the following actions:

- A.** Certifies the FTEIR for the project as described in Section I, above.
- B.** Approves and incorporates into the project all project elements and relevant 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures identified in the project's FTEIR.
- C.** Adopts these Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations in their entirety as set forth in Section II, above.
- D.** Readopts the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the 2003 LRDP EIR in their entirety.
- E.** Having certified the FTEIR, independently reviewed and analyzed the FTEIR and any comments received on these documents, incorporated into the project all project elements and relevant 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures, adopted the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, and readopted the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the 2003 LRDP EIR, the University hereby approves the design and construction of Veterinary Medicine 3B.