

VETERINARY MEDICINE
LABORATORY AND EQUINE
ATHLETIC PERFORMANCE
LABORATORY FACILITIES

FINAL FOCUSED TIERED EIR

Prepared for
Planning and Budget Office
376 Mrak Hall
University of California
One Shields Avenue
Davis, CA 95616

July 6, 2000

URS Greiner Woodward Clyde

URS Greiner Woodward Clyde
500 12th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, California 94607
510006700500

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1	Introduction.....	1-1
	1.1 Purpose of the Final Environmental Impact Report.....	1-1
	1.2 Format of the Final Environmental Impact Report.....	1-1
Section 2	Revised Summary Of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	2-1
Section 3	Changes to the Draft EIR.....	3-1
	3.1 Changes to the Draft EIR.....	3-1
	3.2 Changes to the Initial Study.....	3-2
Section 4	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.....	4-1
Section 5	Comments and Responses to Comments.....	5-1
Section 6	List of Preparers.....	6-1
	6.1 Lead Agency.....	6-1
	6.2 Final Environmental Impact Report Authors.....	6-1
Tables		
2-1	Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	2-2
4-1	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.....	4-2

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the University of California (UC) procedures for implementing CEQA, UC Davis is required, after completion of a draft environmental impact report (EIR), to consult with and obtain comments from public agencies that have legal jurisdiction with respect to the proposed project, and to provide the general public with opportunities to comment on the draft EIR. UC Davis is also required to respond to significant environmental issues raised in the review and consultation process. This Final EIR has been prepared to respond to agency and public comments received on the Draft EIR for the UC Davis Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities project. The Draft EIR was issued for public review on April 19, 2000. The public review period lasted from April 19 through June 2, 2000. UC Davis held a public meeting on May 18, 2000, to receive comments on the Draft EIR. A court reporter prepared a transcript of the meeting.

This document and the Draft EIR constitute the Final EIR. The Draft EIR is hereby incorporated by this reference. Copies of the Draft EIR and additional copies of the Final EIR are available for review during normal business hours at the UC Davis Planning and Budget Office, 376 Mrak Hall, UC Davis; the Reserve Reading Room, Shields Library, UC Davis; the Yolo County Public Library, 315 E. 14th Street, Davis; and the Fairfield Suisun Community Library, 1150 Kentucky Street, Fairfield.

The Draft and Final EIRs include extensive references to the 1994 UC Davis Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and the 1994 LRDP EIR. The 1994 LRDP was designed to accommodate projected campus population growth and facilities development through 2005-06, and the 1994 LRDP EIR evaluated the environmental impacts of that growth and development. As allowed under Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines and as stated in the Draft EIR, UC Davis is incorporating by reference portions of the 1994 LRDP EIR (State Clearinghouse Number 94022005). Copies of the 1994 LRDP and the 1994 LRDP EIR are available for inspection and review during normal business hours at the locations listed above.

The Regents of the University of California will certify this Final EIR prior to approving the project. Other agencies may also use this EIR in their review.

1.2 FORMAT OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

A Final EIR is required to include the Draft EIR (which has been incorporated earlier by reference), copies of comments received during public review of the Draft EIR, a list of persons or entities commenting on the Draft EIR, and responses to comments received on the Draft EIR. This Final EIR is organized as follows:

- **Section 1, Introduction**, provides an introduction and overview describing the intended use of the Final EIR.
- **Section 2, Revised Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**, lists the environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project, the level of significance of impacts prior to mitigation, the 1994 LRDP EIR mitigation measures

that are recommended for the project, and the level of significance of the impacts after mitigation.

- **Section 3, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**, reports on the mitigation monitoring or reporting program (MMRP) for the proposed project.
- **Section 4, Comments and Responses to Comments**, contains a list of all agencies and persons who submitted comments on the Draft EIR during the public review period. This section also contains the comment letters followed by responses to comments. Each letter and each comment within a letter have been given a number. Responses are numbered so that they correspond to the appropriate comment. Where appropriate, responses are cross-referenced between letters. This section also includes the transcript from the public hearing and responses to comments received at that hearing.
- **Section 5, List of Preparers**, presents the UC Davis authors, the technical specialists and consultants, the production team, and other key individuals who assisted in the preparation and review of the Final EIR.

Table 2-1 provides an overview of the environmental impact analyses contained in Section 3 of the Focused Tiered Draft EIR. The summary table presents (1) environmental impacts, (2) their level of significance prior to mitigation, (3) recommended mitigation measures that are derived from the 1994 LRDP EIR, and (4) the level of significance with mitigation. This summary table has been revised to include an additional mitigation measure associated with a cumulative traffic impact (discussed in Section 3 of the FEIR).

Table 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
3.1 Transportation and Circulation			
3.1-1 Increases in traffic volumes associated with the proposed Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities in relationship to the capacity of the future transportation network, would not result in level of service standard violations.	LS	<i>No mitigation required.</i>	LS
3.1-2 Cumulative increases in traffic volumes in relationship to the capacity of the future transportation network would result in level of service standard exceedances. The proposed project's contribution to these exceedances is considered a <i>less-than-significant impact</i> .	LS	The Campus will monitor traffic volumes at the Hutchison Drive and Health Sciences Drive intersection every three years. If and when signalization is warranted based on traffic volumes, the Campus will install a new traffic signal at this location.	LS
3.2 Air Quality			
3.2-1 Operation of the proposed Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities would generate ROGs, NO _x , PM ₁₀ , and CO emissions from vehicle exhaust and energy use.	LS	<i>No mitigation required.</i>	LS

¹ LS = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant, Unavoidable

² Impacts are significant on a cumulative level only; project level impacts will be less than significant. The project's contribution to the impact will not be cumulatively considerable.

Table 2-1 (continued)

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
<p>3.2-3 The proposed Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities, in conjunction with 1994 LRDP development, the WWTP Replacement Project, and cumulative development in the region, would result in increased emissions of criteria pollutants.</p>	<p>SU²</p>	<p>1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>4.5-6(a) <i>Implement Mitigation Measures 4.5-3(a) and (b).</i></p> <p>4.5-6(b) <i>The Sacramento Air Basin includes a large number of jurisdictions, including the greater Sacramento metropolitan area. In the Basin, air quality is regulated by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, YSAQMD, and a number of other Air Pollution Control Districts. Pursuant to rules, regulations, and policies of those AQMDs and APCDs, as well as adopted general plans throughout the Basin, it is within the jurisdiction of each local government or district to take actions to ensure compliance with the federal Clean Air Act and the California Clean Air Act.</i></p>	<p>SU²</p>
<p>3.2-4 Development allowed under the proposed project, in conjunction with 1994 LRDP development, the WWTP Replacement Project, and cumulative development in the region, would result in increased cumulative CO concentrations at intersections, but would not exceed state or federal air quality standards.</p>	<p>LS</p>	<p><i>No mitigation required.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>

¹ LS = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant, Unavoidable

² Impacts are significant on a cumulative level only; project level impacts will be less than significant. The project's contribution to the impact will not be cumulatively considerable.

Table 2-1 (continued)

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
3.2-5 Operation of the proposed facilities, in conjunction with development anticipated under the 1994 LRDP, could expose campus occupants and Davis-area residents to toxic air contaminants emitted from laboratory uses.	LS	<i>No mitigation required.</i>	LS
3.2-6 Development allowed under the proposed project, in conjunction with 1994 LRDP development, the WWTP Replacement Project and cumulative development in the Davis area, may generate unacceptable cumulative health risks from toxic air contaminants. Inadequate methods exist to assess the magnitude of this impact, and it is therefore considered too speculative to determine the precise level of significance.	SU	<i>No mitigation currently available.</i>	SU
3.3 Hazardous Material and Public Safety			
3.3-1 Implementation of the proposed project would eventually lead to an increase in hazardous chemical use at UC Davis that could expose campus occupants to potential health or safety risks.	LS	<i>No mitigation required.</i>	LS
3.3-2 Implementation of the proposed project could lead to an increase in generation of hazardous chemical waste at UC Davis that could expose campus occupants to potential health or safety risks.	LS	<i>No mitigation required.</i>	LS
3.3-3 Storage of radioactive materials and operation of x-ray machines at the project site could expose campus occupants to potential health or safety risks.	LS	<i>No mitigation required.</i>	LS

¹ LS = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant, Unavoidable

² Impacts are significant on a cumulative level only; project level impacts will be less than significant. The project's contribution to the impact will not be cumulatively considerable.

Table 2-1 (continued)

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation¹	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance Following Mitigation¹
3.3-4 The proposed project would increase the use of laboratory animals at UC Davis, thereby increasing the risk of animal bites and escapes.	LS	<i>No mitigation required.</i>	LS
3.3-5 The proposed project could lead to an increase in the generation of medical (biohazardous) waste at UC Davis that could expose campus occupants to potential health or safety risks.	LS	<i>No mitigation required.</i>	LS
3.3-6 Hazardous materials used at the proposed facilities may be inadvertently released to the sewer or disposed of with non-hazardous solid waste.	LS	<i>No additional mitigation required.</i>	LS
3.3-7 Increased use of hazardous chemical materials related to cumulative development in the region would increase the number of people exposed to health hazards associated with such use.	SU ²	<i>No mitigation available.</i>	SU ²
3.3-8 Implementation of the proposed project, in conjunction with other development in the region that generates hazardous chemical waste, could place an additional load on hazardous waste management facilities.	SU ²	<i>No additional mitigation available.</i>	SU ²
3.3-9 Implementation of the proposed project, in conjunction with other development in the region that generates medical waste, would place an additional load on available medical waste management facilities.	LS	<i>No mitigation required.</i>	LS

¹ LS = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant, Unavoidable

² Impacts are significant on a cumulative level only; project level impacts will be less than significant. The project's contribution to the impact will not be cumulatively considerable.

Table 2-1 (continued)

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
3.4 Biological Resources			
<p>3.4-1 Development of the Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities site would result in the conversion of approximately 7.6 acres of Ruderal/Annual Grassland which could result in the loss of burrowing owl nesting and foraging habitat.</p>	PS	<p>1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>4.7-3(a) <i>The Campus shall continue to monitor the area around the Medical Sciences Complex for the presence or absence of burrowing owls.</i></p> <p>4.7-3(b) <i>The Campus, in consultation with the DFG, shall conduct a pre-construction breeding-season survey (approximately February 1 through August 31) of proposed project site during the same calendar year that construction is planned to begin. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if any burrowing owls are nesting on or directly adjacent to proposed project site.</i></p> <p><i>If phased construction procedures are planned for the proposed project, the results of the above survey shall be valid only for the season when it is conducted.</i></p> <p><i>If, after five years, a previously recorded nest site remains unoccupied by a Swainson's hawk or other raptors, it will no longer be considered as a Swainson's hawk or raptor nest site subject to this mitigation.</i></p>	LS

¹ LS = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant, Unavoidable

² Impacts are significant on a cumulative level only; project level impacts will be less than significant. The project's contribution to the impact will not be cumulatively considerable.

Table 2-1 (continued)

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
		<p>4.7-3(c) <i>During the construction stage, the Campus in consultation with the DFG, shall avoid all burrowing owl nest sites potentially disturbed by project construction during the breeding season while the nest is occupied with adults and/or young. The occupied nest site shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to determine when the nest is no longer used. Avoidance shall include the establishment of a 300-foot to 500-foot diameter non-disturbance buffer zone around the nest site. Disturbance of any nest sites shall only occur outside of the breeding season and when the nests are unoccupied based on monitoring by a DFG approved biologist. The buffer zone shall be delineated by highly visible temporary construction fencing.</i></p> <p><i>Based on approval by DFG, pre-construction and pre-breeding season exclusion measures may be implemented to preclude burrowing owl occupation of the project site prior to project-related disturbance.</i></p>	

¹ LS = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant, Unavoidable

² Impacts are significant on a cumulative level only; project level impacts will be less than significant. The project's contribution to the impact will not be cumulatively considerable.

Table 2-1 (continued)

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
		1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR Mitigation Measures: 6.5-3 <i>In addition to the compensation for the loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-5, the Campus shall also convert either the approximately 55 acres of existing orchards adjacent to Putah Creek at the Russell Ranch or a portion of the 85 acres designated habitat restoration and research area to cover type suitable for burrowing owl nesting habitat.</i>	
3.4-2 Development of the Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities site would result in the conversion of approximately 7.6 acres of Ruderal/Annual Grassland which could result in the loss of raptor (birds-of-prey) nesting habitat.	PS	1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures: 4.7-4(a) <i>The Campus, in consultation with DFG, shall conduct a pre-construction or pre-tree pruning or removal survey of trees greater than 30-feet tall (proposed activity) during the raptor breeding-season (approximately March 1 through August 31). The survey 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.</i> <i>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.</i>	LS

¹ LS = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant, Unavoidable

² Impacts are significant on a cumulative level only; project level impacts will be less than significant. The project's contribution to the impact will not be cumulatively considerable.

Table 2-1 (continued)

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
		<p>4.7-4(b) <i>The Campus shall continue to conduct annual surveys to determine the location of nesting Swainson's hawks and other raptors on the Campus. If nesting Swainson's hawks or other raptors are found during the survey at a previously unknown location within one-half mile of a project site and not within 100 yards of a previously documented site, the Campus shall, prior to project construction, contact the California Department of Fish and Game to determine the potential for disturbance to nesting Swainson's hawks and other raptors and will implement feasible changes in the construction schedule or other appropriate adjustments to the project in response to the specific circumstances.</i></p> <p><i>If, after five years, a previously recorded nest site remains unoccupied by a Swainson's hawk or other raptors, it will no longer be considered as a Swainson's hawk or raptor nest site subject to this mitigation.</i></p>	
<p>3.4-3 Development of the Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities site would result in the conversion of approximately 7.6 acres of Ruderal/Annual Grassland which would result in the loss of foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk and other resident and migratory species.</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure:</p> <p>4.7-5 <i>As Agricultural Land and Ruderal/Annual Grassland is converted to Campus development under the 1994 LRDP, the Campus will compensate for the loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat at a 1:1 ratio of acres lost to acres preserved through the implementation of one or a combination of the following methods.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Approximately 40 acres of Cropland habitat in the "C" tract adjacent to the Putah Creek Reserve on the West Campus will remain Campus agricultural research uses but will be under land use restrictions that will ensure cropland cover types that are suitable as Swainson's hawk foraging habitat.</i> 	<p>LS</p>

¹ LS = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant, Unavoidable

² Impacts are significant on a cumulative level only; project level impacts will be less than significant. The project's contribution to the impact will not be cumulatively considerable.

Table 2-1 (continued)

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>No incompatible uses such as orchards, vineyard, or development will be allowed in the areas set aside for Swainson's hawk foraging habitat. However, normal crop rotations may periodically result in unsuitable cover types of annual crops.</i> • <i>Approximately 20 acres of land within the North Fork Cutoff that currently support livestock enclosures will be restored to a woodland and grassland habitat.</i> • <i>Approximately 55 acres of existing orchards adjacent to Putah Creek at the Russell Ranch will be removed, converted to a cover type suitable for Swainson's hawk foraging, and added to the Putah Creek Reserve.</i> • <i>Approximately 85 acres at the Russell Ranch that have been designated as a habitat restoration and research area will include the establishment of cover types that are suitable Swainson's hawk foraging habitat.</i> 	
<p>3.4-4 Development of the Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities site could result in the potential failure of Swainson's hawk nesting efforts.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>4.7-6(a) <i>The Campus shall conduct a pre-construction breeding season survey of the proposed project site, and within a one-half-mile radius of the site, to determine the presence or absence of any nesting Swainson's hawks.</i></p> <p><i>If any Swainson's hawks are nesting within a one-half-mile radius of the project site, the Campus shall, in consultation with DFG, determine the potential for disturbance to nesting Swainson's hawks and will implement feasible changes in the construction schedule or other appropriate adjustments to the project in response to the specific circumstances.</i></p>	<p>LS</p>

¹ LS = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant, Unavoidable

² Impacts are significant on a cumulative level only; project level impacts will be less than significant. The project's contribution to the impact will not be cumulatively considerable.

Table 2-1 (continued)

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
		<p>4.7-6(b) <i>The Campus shall continue to conduct annual surveys to determine the location of nesting Swainson's hawks on and within 1/2-mile of the Campus. If nesting Swainson's hawks are found during the survey at a previously unknown location within one-half mile of a project site and not within 100 yards of a previously documented site, the University shall, prior to project construction, contact the California Department of Fish and Game to determine the potential for disturbance to nesting Swainson's hawks and will implement feasible changes in the construction schedule or other appropriate adjustments to the project in response to the specific circumstances.</i></p> <p><i>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.</i></p>	
<p>3.4-5 Development of the proposed Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities, in conjunction with 1994 LRDP development and the WWTP Replacement Project, would result in the loss of Agricultural Land and Ruderal/Annual Grassland habitat for resident and migratory wildlife species.</p>	<p>SU²</p>	<p>1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>4.7-9(a) <i>Implement 1994 LRDP Mitigation Measures 4.7-1, 4.7-3, 4.7-4, 4.7-5, and 4.7-6.</i></p> <p>4.7-9(b) <i>The County of Yolo, when implementing the County-wide Habitat Management Plan, should impose a 1:1 mitigation ratio of habitat preserved to that converted on all development projects within their jurisdiction that convert Agricultural Land and Annual Grassland habitat to urban development.</i></p>	<p>SU²</p>

¹ LS = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; S = Significant; SU = Significant, Unavoidable

² Impacts are significant on a cumulative level only; project level impacts will be less than significant. The project's contribution to the impact will not be cumulatively considerable.

This Focused Tiered Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) analyzes specific potential environmental impacts of the proposed Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Performance Laboratory Facilities in four resource areas: transportation and circulation, air quality, hazardous materials and public safety, and biological resources.

1.1 PURPOSE OF REPORT

UC Davis has prepared this Focused Tiered DEIR on the proposed Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Performance Laboratory Facilities for the following purposes.

- to satisfy the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
- to inform the general public, the local community, responsible and interested public agencies, and the University of the nature of the proposed project, the possible environmental impacts, possible measures to mitigate those impacts, and alternatives to the proposed project
- to enable The Board of Regents (The Regents) of the University of California (University) to consider environmental consequences when deciding whether to approve the project

As described in the CEQA Guidelines, public agencies are charged with the duty to avoid or minimize environmental damage where feasible. In discharging this duty, the public agency has an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social (Section 15021 of the CEQA Guidelines). This Focused Tiered DEIR is a public information document, the purpose of which is to identify the potential significant effects of the proposed project on the environment, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be avoided or mitigated, to identify any unavoidable adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated, and to identify reasonable and feasible alternatives to the proposed project that would eliminate any significant adverse environmental effects, or reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. The Focused Tiered DEIR also discloses growth inducing impacts, effects found not to be significant, and cumulative impacts.

The public agency (The Regents) is required to consider the information in the Focused Tiered EIR, along with any other relevant information, in making its decision on whether to implement the project (Section 15121 of the CEQA Guidelines). Although the Focused Tiered EIR does not determine the ultimate decision that will be made regarding implementation of the project, The Regents must consider the information in the EIR and respond to each significant effect identified in the Focused Tiered EIR.

For the proposed Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities project, CEQA requires that the University prepare a DEIR that reflects the independent judgement of the University regarding the impacts, level of significance of the impacts both before and after mitigation, and mitigation measures proposed to reduce the impacts. The Focused Tiered DEIR is then circulated to responsible agencies, trustee agencies with resources affected by the project, and interested agencies and individuals. The purpose of public and agency review of the DEIR include sharing expertise, disclosing agency analyses, checking for accuracy, detecting omissions, discovering public concerns, and soliciting counterproposals. In reviewing the Focused Tiered DEIR, reviewers should focus on the

sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the proposed project might be avoided or mitigated.

1.2 SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project includes the construction and operation of a new Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and a new Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory in the Health Sciences District of the Central Campus of UC Davis. The Veterinary Medicine Laboratory facility would consist of a laboratory, animal holding facilities for both large and small animals, a canine blood donor holding facility, an instructional lecture hall and other ancillary facilities including exercise runs for dogs and other small animals and a pasture to hold large animals. The Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory would include a laboratory with three treadmills and other facilities such as a “hot walker,” a round pen, and a large animal holding facility. The project would replace old, inadequate facilities that are currently used by the School of Veterinary Medicine to instruct students in the DVM curriculum in veterinary surgery and to conduct research, clinical instruction and teaching in the areas of cardiovascular and respiratory physiology of horses and other animals.

1.3 EIR REVIEW PROCESS

Tiered EIR

This environmental analysis is a Focused Tiered DEIR for the proposed Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities. The environmental analysis for the proposed project is tiered from the UC Davis 1994 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) EIR in accordance with Section 15152 and 15168(c) of the CEQA Guidelines. The 1994 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.). The 1994 LRDP EIR analyzed full implementation of uses and physical development proposed under the 1994 LRDP through the academic year 2005-06 and identified measures to mitigate the significant adverse project and cumulative impacts associated with that growth.

The CEQA concept of "tiering" refers to the coverage of general environmental matters in broad program-level EIRs, with subsequent focused environmental documents for individual projects that implement the program. The project environmental document incorporates by reference the discussions in the Program EIR and concentrates on project-specific issues. CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines encourage the use of tiered environmental documents to reduce delays and excessive paperwork in the environmental review process. This is accomplished in tiered documents by eliminating repetitive analyses of issues that were adequately addressed in the Program EIR and by incorporating those analyses by reference.

The State CEQA Guidelines at §15152(f)(3) provide that “[s]ignificant environmental effects have been ‘adequately addressed’ in a previous program EIR if the lead agency determines that:

- (a) they have been mitigated or avoided as a result of the prior environmental impact report and findings adopted in connection with that prior environmental report;

- (b) they have been examined at a sufficient level of detail in the prior environmental impact report 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 later project; or
- (c) they cannot be mitigated to avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts despite the project proponent's willingness to accept all feasible mitigation measures, and the only purpose of including analysis of such effects in another environmental impact report would be to put the agency in a position to adopt a statement of overriding considerations with respect to the effects."

These criteria are applied in the analysis set forth in this Focused Tiered DEIR. The tiering of the environmental analysis for the proposed project allows this DEIR to rely on the 1994 LRDP EIR for the following.

- (a) a discussion of general background and setting information for environmental topic areas
- (b) overall growth-related issues
- (c) issues that were evaluated in sufficient detail in the 1994 LRDP EIR for which there is no significant new information or change in circumstances that would require further analysis
- (d) long-term cumulative impacts

All applicable 1994 LRDP EIR mitigation measures, as identified in the Tiered Initial Study, are incorporated into and made part of the project. For a more detailed discussion of impacts to other resource areas not analyzed further in the body of this Focused Tiered DEIR, please refer to the Tiered Initial Study, which is included as Appendix A.

Public Review

In accordance with Section 15063 and 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the campus published a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Tiered Initial Study (TIS) that were circulated for a 30-day period of public review comment from February 15, 2000 to March 15, 2000. Copies of the NOP, TIS and ensuing comments from the public are included in this document as Appendix A and B. Copies of these documents are also available at the UC Davis Planning and Budget Office at 376 Mrak Hall, UC Davis and the Reserve Reading Room at Shields Library, UC Davis.

This Focused Tiered DEIR will begin public circulation on April 19, 2000, for a 45-day period of review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies, and organizations. The public review period will conclude at 5 p.m. on June 2, 2000. All comments or questions about the DEIR should be addressed to:

Richard F. Keller
Planning and Budget Office, 376 Mrak Hall
University of California
One Shields Avenue
Davis, California 95616

Comments relating to the Focused Tiered DEIR may also be presented orally during the public hearing on Thursday, May 18, 2000 at 7:00 p.m. at the University Club on Old Davis Road at UC Davis. Following the public hearing on this document and after the close of the written public comment period, responses to written and oral comments on the environmental effects of the project will be prepared and published in the Final Focused Tiered EIR document. The EIR (comprised of the Draft EIR and the Final EIR documents) will be considered by The Regents in a public meeting and will be certified if it is determined to be in compliance with CEQA. Following certification of the Focused Tiered EIR, The Regents will consider approval of the proposed project. CEQA requires the decision makers to balance the benefits of a proposed project against any unavoidable environmental impacts. If environmental impacts are identified as significant and unavoidable, The Regents may still approve the project if it believes that social, economic, or other benefits outweigh the unavoidable impacts. The Regents would then be required to state in writing the specific reasons for approving the project based on information in the Focused Tiered EIR and other information in the record. As indicated in Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, this reasoning is called a "statement of overriding considerations."

CEQA Findings and Mitigation Monitoring

CEQA requires that when a public agency makes findings based on an EIR, the public agency must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for those measures which it has adopted or made a condition of the project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6). The reporting and monitoring program must be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6).

The Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities will be prepared, and will be considered by The Regents in conjunction with review of Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities project.

1.4 LEAD AND RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES

The Board of Regents (The Regents) of the University of California (University) is the lead agency for the proposed project evaluated in this Focused Tiered DEIR because it has principal responsibility for reviewing and certifying the adequacy of this document and approving the project. Distinct from the lead agency are responsible agencies with permitting or approval authority over the project. The State Water Resources Control Board is a responsible agency for this project with regards to compliance with NPDES requirements.

1.5 DECISION TO PREPARE A FOCUSED TIERED EIR

The Tiered Initial Study (Appendix A) prepared for the proposed project evaluated potential environmental effects of the proposed project and identified which issues would require further analysis in the EIR and which issues were fully evaluated in the TIS and would not require additional analysis. The analysis contained in the Tiered Initial Study concluded that in all resource areas (see list below), the proposed project would either result in no impact, a less-than-significant impact, a less-than-significant impact due to incorporation of 1994 LRDP EIR mitigation measures, a de minimis contribution to a significant, unavoidable impact identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR or, a significant unavoidable cumulative impact identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR for which no new mitigation measures are available and no new analysis is proposed:

- Land Use and Planning
- Agriculture Resources
- Population and Housing
- Transportation/Circulation
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Biological Resources
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Geology and Soils
- Mineral Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Aesthetics
- Recreation
- Public Services
- Utilities and Service Systems

Based on the analysis performed in the TIS, it has been determined that the proposed project would not result in any potentially significant impacts that are not sufficiently addressed and mitigated by the 1994 LRDP EIR, as amended. Therefore, the TIS was an adequate environmental review of the project, and a Negative Declaration could have been prepared. However, the proposed project is potentially controversial due to the use of animals in the proposed facilities. Therefore, a Focused Tiered DEIR has been prepared for the project. This Focused Tiered DEIR evaluates the potential impacts of the project in the following resource areas.

- Air Quality: operational air quality impacts due to emissions of criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants
- Transportation and Circulation: level of service impacts from increased vehicular traffic in the Health Sciences District
- Hazardous Materials and Public Safety: impacts from increased use and generation of hazardous chemicals and waste, radioactive materials and waste, biohazardous materials and waste, and laboratory animal use by the laboratories included in the project
- Biological Resources: impacts of project construction and operation on nearby nesting burrowing owls, Swainson's hawks and other raptors

It should be noted that during the preparation of this Focused Tiered DEIR, certain reporting discrepancies were found in the TIS. Furthermore, as additional information was reviewed, it was determined that certain environmental impacts would not result from the proposed project. Where there are differences in the information reported in the EIR and the TIS, the information reported in the DEIR supercedes the information in the TIS.

1.6 RELATIONSHIP TO THE 1994 LRDP AND LRDP EIR

1994 LRDP

The 1994 LRDP, as amended, was designed to accommodate projected campus population growth and facilities development through 2005-06. The 1994 LRDP identifies physical planning principles to guide campus development and includes a land use plan that identifies zones on campus that could be used as future building sites for academic and administrative uses, teaching and research fields, support functions, housing, recreational uses, open space, parking, and commercial and potential enterprise opportunities. The 1994 LRDP projected a campus increase in available academic, administrative, and support building space of 1,750,000 assignable square feet (asf), representing an increase from about 4,745,740 asf to about 6,495,740 asf. Since adoption of the 1994 LRDP, approximately 459,086 asf of space has been approved, constructed, or occupied. The 46,484 asf of academic and administrative use proposed under the project would not exceed planned development and would be consistent with the development approved under the 1994 LRDP (please refer to Appendix A, Tiered Initial Study and Notice of Preparation, Section IV, for additional discussion on other projects under consideration that would also increase the assignable square footage of the campus).

The 1994 LRDP also established population projections for buildout of the LRDP. At buildout of the 1994 LRDP, campus population is projected to be 38,630 (26,000 students and 12,630 faculty and staff). The current estimates of population (1998-99) for campus faculty, staff and students is 32,982 (22,803 students and 10,179 faculty and staff). Recently approved projects including the 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects, Center for the Arts Performance Hall and South Entry Roadway Project, 1999 Chilled Water Expansion Project, and the USDA Western Haman Nutrition Research Center would add approximately 175 new campus employees, and therefore once these projects are built, campus faculty and staff population would increase to 10,354. The proposed project would result in a projected population increase

of 37 people, 36 students and 1 employee. As a result, the number of students on campus would increase to approximately 22,839 and the faculty and staff population would increase to 10,355. This would be within and consistent with the population projections in the 1994 LRDP (please refer to Appendix A, Tiered Initial Study and Notice of Preparation, Section IV, for additional discussion on other projects under consideration that would also result in an increase in campus population).

1994 LRDP EIR

The 1994 LRDP EIR is a program EIR, prepared pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 15000 et seq.). The 1994 LRDP EIR analyzed full implementation of uses and physical development proposed under the 1994 LRDP through the academic year 2005-06 and identified measures to mitigate the significant adverse project and cumulative impacts associated with that growth. The environmental analysis in the 1994 LRDP EIR (State Clearinghouse #94022005) was amended by the Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Replacement Project EIR (State Clearinghouse #95123027 and #96072024) in 1997, by the 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR (State Clearinghouse #97122016) in 1998, by the Center for the Arts Performance Hall and South Entry Roadway and Parking Improvements Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse #98092016) in 1998, and by the USDA Western Human Nutrition Research Center Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse #99092060) in 1999. Hereafter, references to the 1994 LRDP EIR include the 1994 LRDP EIR as amended by the subsequent documents unless otherwise noted, as allowed under Section 15150 of the CEQA Guidelines. All documents are available for review during normal operating hours at the UC Davis Planning and Budget Office at 376 Mrak Hall, UC Davis and the Reserve Reading Room at Shields Library, UC Davis.

The WWTP Replacement Project EIR identified the loss of an additional 20 acres of prime agricultural land that was not identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR analysis. As a result, the magnitude of several land use and biological resource impacts associated with the conversion of prime agricultural land and the conversion of Agricultural Land and Ruderal/Annual Grassland habitat were increased. (see Appendix A of the WWTP Replacement Project EIR).

The 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR identified the loss of 20 acres of prime agricultural land and 31 acres of Agricultural Land and Ruderal/Annual Grassland over that anticipated in the 1994 LRDP EIR, as amended by the WWTP Replacement Project EIR. As a result, the magnitude of several land use and biological resource impacts associated with the conversion of prime agricultural land and the conversion of Agricultural Land and Ruderal/Annual Grassland habitat were increased. To mitigate identified land use and biological resource impacts associated with the conversion of prime agricultural land and Ruderal/Annual Grassland habitat, 20 acres of land at the Russell Ranch was redesignated from Academic and Administrative Low Density to Teaching/Research Fields.

The 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR also included an updated analysis of transportation and circulation impacts. This analysis reflected the decision by the City of Davis not to expand the Richards Boulevard Underpass from 2 lanes to 4 lanes. The analysis also included more recent traffic numbers. The results of the analysis indicated that the operating performance of several intersections would decrease to Level of Service E or F during A.M. or

P.M. peak hour operating conditions. The 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR also revised 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) which identifies feasible improvements to reduce some transportation and circulation impacts to a less-than-significant level (see Appendix A of the 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR). The updated transportation and circulation analysis in the 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR is used as the basis for analysis for cumulative impacts in all later EIRs tiered from the 1994 LRDP.

Mitigation measures identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR that apply to proposed project will be required to be implemented as part of the project. The mitigation measures in the 1994 LRDP EIR that are appropriate to be implemented as part of the proposed project are identified and discussed in the Tiered Initial Study (Appendix A) and in Section 3 of this Focused Tiered DEIR, as appropriate.

1.7 REQUIRED PERMITS

Because the total area disturbed by the proposed project is greater than 5 acres, UC Davis will be required to file a Notice of Intent with the State Water Resources Control Board in compliance with NPDES requirements and will implement a storm water pollution prevention plan during project construction as required by the General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activity.

1.8 REPORT ORGANIZATION

The Focused Tiered DEIR is organized in the following sections:

- *Executive Summary.* Summarizes environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project, describes proposed mitigation measures, and indicates the level of significance of impacts after mitigation. It also presents alternatives to the proposed project and known areas of controversy.
- *Section 1 Introduction.* Provides an introduction and overview describing the intended use and scope of the Focused Tiered DEIR, its relationship to the 1994 LRDP and LRDP EIR, as amended, and the environmental review process.
- *Section 2 Project Description.* Provides a detailed description of the proposed project, including its location, background information, major objectives, and structural and technical characteristics.
- *Section 3 Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation.* Contains project-specific and cumulative impact analyses for each resource area identified for further analysis in the TIS (Appendix A). For each resource area, it provides a description of the environmental setting, potential impacts of the project, cumulative impacts of this project in conjunction with the overall growth and development included in the 1994 LRDP and in the Davis region and mitigation measures.
- *Section 4 Other CEQA Considerations.* Provides a discussion of growth inducement, significant and unavoidable impacts, and irreversible environmental effects of the proposed project.

- *Section 5 Alternatives to the Proposed Project.* Identifies and discusses alternatives considered in the development of the proposed project and the associated environmental effects.
- *Section 6 References.* Itemizes supporting and reference sources used in the preparation of the Focused Tiered DEIR.
- *Section 7 Report Preparers and Individuals Consulted.* Identifies the persons who prepared the Focused Tiered DEIR and those who were consulted during its preparation.
- *Appendix A.* Contains the Notice of Preparation and TIS for the Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities.
- *Appendix B.* Contains the comments received on the Notice of Preparation and TIS and responses to the comments.
- *Appendix C.* Contains guidelines on the care and use of laboratory animals.

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

UC Davis

The 5,300-acre UC Davis campus is located in Yolo and Solano Counties approximately 72 miles northeast of San Francisco, 15 miles west of the City of Sacramento, and adjacent to the City of Davis (see Figure 1). The campus, in general, is made up of four units: the Central Campus, the South Campus, the West Campus, and Russell Ranch (see Figure 2). The term “Main Campus” is used to refer to Central, South and West Campus units collectively and excludes Russell Ranch. The Central Campus is bounded approximately by Russell Boulevard to the north, Highway 113 (State Route 113) to the west, Interstate 80 (I-80) and the Union Pacific Railroad tracks to the south, and 1st and A Streets in the City of Davis to the east. The South Campus is located south of I-80 and north of the South Fork of Putah Creek. The West Campus is bounded to the east by Highway 113, to the north by Russell Boulevard, to the south by Putah Creek and to the west by privately owned lands. While the Central, South and West Campus units are contiguous, Russell Ranch is located to the west of West Campus and is separated from that campus unit by 1½ miles of privately owned agricultural land.

Project Site

The proposed facilities would be constructed on an approximately 7-acre site in the southern portion of Health Sciences District of the Central Campus (see Figure 3). Adjacent land uses include Garrod Drive and the Veterinary Medicine Diagnostic Building (Thurman Hall) to the north, the Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital (VMTH) to the east, the Equestrian Center and the Campus Arboretum to the south and Highway 113 right-of-way to the west. The site is not developed with any permanent structures. Although the site is essentially flat, it has been substantially altered into an equestrian cross county riding course complete with a small hill, man-made obstacles, and jumps, and is currently used by the Equestrian Center to exercise horses. This riding course will not be replaced at another location on campus.

2.2 NEED FOR THE PROJECT

The proposed project supports the instruction and research missions of the University of California by providing essential facilities for graduate professional education in the School of Veterinary Medicine (SVM). UC Davis’ SVM offers a four-year Doctor of Veterinary Medicine (DVM) program. This program is designed to provide fundamental concepts and knowledge of veterinary science and training in clinical skills sufficient to enable graduates to enter a chosen area of veterinary medicine with an entry level of professional competency. The surgical curriculum under this program consists of both core and elective courses. The core courses are designed to introduce students to principles and techniques of surgery, to begin developing skills in the anesthetic management of patients, and to develop an understanding of the importance of anatomy in surgical planning. The elective surgical courses are designed to build upon the skills acquired in the core courses and to focus on common surgical problems of individual animal species. In order to provide this instruction, the SVM utilizes a number of animal species that are acquired either from outside sources or reared on campus.

Figure 1

Figure 2

Blank

Figure 3

The project responds to and aims at correcting facility adequacy issues raised in the 1998 accreditation evaluation of the SVM by the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), and a citation by the American Association for Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care (AAALAC). This project would enable UC Davis to continue to meet accreditation requirements and to maintain the quality of its SVM program.

Surgical training facilities are currently located in Haring Hall, Haring Annex, Haring Barn, and at N Barn in the Animal Resources Services (ARS) facilities (Figure 4). These facilities were designed in the late 1940s for a class size of 48 students. Since then not only has the class size of students in the DVM program grown significantly, but animal surgery techniques have also changed dramatically. Additionally, during this time, AAALAC, National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) have developed guidelines and standards related to medical and surgical care and housing of animals used in teaching and research. The new animal surgery facilities would ensure full compliance with these guidelines and standards.

The AVMA is the accreditation body for all veterinary teaching programs in the United States and Canada. In 1998, AVMA conducted an evaluation of existing facilities at the SVM at UC Davis. AVMA's 1998 accreditation report stated that the animal surgery instructional facilities were inadequate and not sufficiently contemporary in design to ensure an appropriate learning environment. Specific items included in the report with respect to surgery instructional facilities in Haring Hall and Annex include the following:

- Crowded conditions that result from 61 DVM students using the laboratories and support space that are designed for 48 DVM students, and resultant inability to maintain the needed levels of cleanliness and protection against contamination in the surgery rooms and support areas
- Inadequate heating, ventilation and air-conditioning systems
- Inadequate surgery support and storage facilities
- Inadequate lighting
- The distance between facilities is not conducive to efficient class scheduling or faculty interaction

Similarly, N Barn on the South Campus, which is used to train DVM students in food animal surgery, also suffers from the following deficiencies.

- Surgeries are located in a converted barn that was not designed to meet the requirements of a modern surgical facility
- The facilities are difficult to clean
- There are no support facilities (scrub room, pharmacy, service laboratory, built-in storage areas)
- There is no lecture hall facility

Figure 4

- The facility is physically remote from other DVM facilities and therefore much time and energy is lost by students, faculty, and technicians traveling to and from the facility

In addition to the animal surgeries, the SVM utilizes two equine treadmills for purposes of research, clinical instruction, and teaching in the fields of cardiovascular and respiratory physiology of horses and other vertebrates. The research treadmill is housed in Haring Barn, a 50+-year-old facility that was renovated to serve as an interim treadmill laboratory (Figure 4). The facility needs improved lighting, electrical service, ventilation, climate control, and emergency exits.

Associated with the research treadmill is an electronics and instrumentation room that is currently located in a converted barn. This room has inadequate electrical service and is very difficult to keep clean. Similarly, a biochemistry/analytical laboratory that is used to analyze blood samples has been added to the building. This laboratory is not supplied with de-ionized water, gas or fumehoods. Another laboratory used with the treadmill is located in a converted garage and is in need of repair.

A clinical treadmill facility is currently located at an interim location between the B Barn and the C Barn at the VMTH (Figure 3). The treadmill was built in a driveway and has a roof and walls but no environmental controls, making it difficult to use at certain times of the year. A subterranean steam pipeline running beneath the treadmill compounds this problem. The facility is located adjacent to a dirt arena and the equipment in the room is chronically covered in dust. The treadmill at this location generates noise that can be bothersome to adjacent land uses. Both treadmills and associated facilities were cited by AAALAC and AVMA as not meeting the minimum standards for treadmill operation, and therefore need to be upgraded. The proposed project would construct modern facilities and thereby address the existing deficiencies in the instructional surgery and treadmill laboratory facilities.

The proposed project would locate the new facilities at one centralized location on Garrod Drive in the southern portion of the Health Sciences District adjacent to other veterinary medicine facilities including the VMTH, the Veterinary Medicine Diagnostic facility, and the Equestrian Center. This would eliminate unnecessary travel across the campus and allow better class scheduling.

The proposed project would also provide the needed laboratory space for the projected increase in enrollment in the DVM program. In 1998-99, the State of California provided an augmentation of \$2.5 million specifically to the SVM to allow a phased increase in enrollment from a class of 122 DVM to 131 DVM students per year. The phase-in would be completed by 2007-08. The proposed facilities would accommodate a class of 131 DVM students per year.

The project would address another existing problem at the SVM that results from the location of the existing animal surgeries and the equine treadmill in the heart of the core campus. The dogs to be spayed/neutered are housed in the Haring Kennel that is near the Campus Silo Student Center, a congregating area for students and visitors. The barking of the dogs in the kennel can be disturbing to these people who do not know of the SVM's program. Similarly, horses used in chronic exercise studies are housed in the Haring Wing Barn and are sometimes observed by other students who misinterpret a heavily exercised animal as having been mistreated. The proposed project would relocate these facilities to an area where adjacent land uses are also

focused on animal holding and care. The project would also place the surgeries, the equine performance facility in close proximity of the animal holding facility and thereby eliminate the need to move animals between housing and the laboratory facilities.

Lastly, the project would relocate canine blood donors from distant facilities at the ARS to the vicinity of the VMTH. A critical component of the small animal clinical service at the VMTH, and especially for emergency and surgical cases, are blood donors that supply a variety of blood products to patients in need of transfusions. Historically, a small cadre of blood donor dogs were housed and maintained in the VMTH to provide fresh blood needs of canine patients, and commercial product was purchased to satisfy the balance of the needs. In the past two years, however, commercial suppliers have been unable to meet the demand in the veterinary profession for blood products and the VMTH has had to expand its blood donor colony. Currently, there are 10 blood donor dogs housed at the VMTH and another 24 dogs are housed at the ARS. The VMTH projects the need to expand the colony to 40 blood donor dogs. Housing some of the dogs presents numerous problems. Sometimes, blood is needed immediately (within 10-15 minutes) but if an ARS donor is used, the turnaround time is close to one hour. Also, the dogs at the ARS do not receive the same level of interaction as those housed at the VMTH. The proposed canine blood donor facility would locate the dogs near the VMTH to address these problems.

In essence, the proposed project would eliminate facility deficiencies related to the animal surgeries and equine athletic performance facilities, provide space for a larger class size, centralize all veterinary medicine-related facilities in one portion of the campus and eliminate unnecessary cross-campus travel by students, staff and faculty, and eliminate the need to move animals between housing and the laboratory facilities, and would move these facilities to a portion of the campus where the ongoing activities would not be bothersome to persons not related to the SVM programs.

2.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The campus has identified the following objectives for the proposed project.

- Provide modern animal surgery teaching facilities in order to allow the School of Veterinary Medicine (SVM) to meet accreditation requirements and ensure full compliance with applicable guidelines and standards
- Provide additional space needed to accommodate a larger student class size
- Consolidate veterinary medicine facilities in one portion of the campus near the VMTH and reduce cross-campus travel by students, faculty and staff
- Move veterinary facilities away from the center of the campus where noises (e.g., barking dogs) and movement of large animals can be disruptive to other nearby teaching facilities
- Allow for the efficient use of land resources on the campus

2.4 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project includes the construction and operation of a new Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and a new Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory in the southern portion of Health Sciences District of the Central Campus. The Veterinary Medicine Laboratory facility would consist of a laboratory, animal holding facilities for both large and small animals, a canine blood donor holding facility, an instructional lecture hall and other ancillary facilities including exercise runs for dogs and other small animals and a pasture to hold large animals. The Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory would include a laboratory with three treadmills and other facilities such as a “hot walker,” a round pen, and an equine holding facility.

Currently, large and small animal surgical training is provided in the animal surgery teaching facilities located in Haring Hall, Haring Annex and associated animal holding area for livestock and horses in Haring Barn in the academic core of the Central Campus. The location of these facilities is shown on Figure 4. Training in food animal surgery is provided in “N” Barn at the ARS facilities on the South Campus. Treadmills used for research and teaching in cardiovascular and respiratory physiology of horses are located in Haring Barn and at a location near the VMTH. Canine blood donors are housed at two locations, near the VHTH and at the ARS on the South Campus.

Currently, there are no plans to backfill the space that would be released when the functions are moved into the new facilities. It is likely though, that due to the age of the structures, they would be demolished to construct new facilities at that site. However, the vacated structures would stay in place until the campus develops a specific proposal for the site. Therefore, demolition of these facilities would be a consequence of a future project that would involve use of the land underlying the existing buildings. Analysis of demolition impacts would occur with the analysis of a future project to be constructed at the site.

The proposed facilities would include up to five new buildings and a number of outdoor ancillary facilities (see Figure 5 and Table 2.4-1). Each of the proposed improvements is described below:

**TABLE 2.4-1
PROPOSED FACILITIES**

Facility	Gross Square Feet	Assignable Square Feet
Veterinary Medicine Laboratory ¹	36,821	20,620
Large and Small Animal Holding	23,614	13,224
Canine Blood Donor Facility	2,340	1,692
Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory	14,407	8,068
Large Animal Holding	4,965	2,880
Total	82,147	46,484

¹ Includes Surgical Lecture Hall

Figure 5

Veterinary Medicine Laboratory Facility

The new laboratory on the west side of Garrod Drive would provide a modern animal surgery teaching facility with the flexibility necessary to accommodate program change, increased student enrollment, and new laboratory techniques. The nature and logistics of animal surgery instruction require special-purpose laboratory and support facilities to meet the needs of the DVM teaching program. Before each surgical laboratory session, the surgery facilities are in use for 3-4 hours for preparation of animals and equipment by DVM students and staff. Animals must be selected, brought to holding facilities that must be located near the laboratories, and weighed for determination of anesthetic and drug doses that will be needed during the surgical procedures. The animals must then be prepared for surgery, anesthetized and transported to the surgical operating rooms. Each surgery session typically lasts from 4 to 7 or more hours, depending on the complexity of the procedure, possible complications during the procedure, and the level of dexterity of the students performing the operation. Post-operative care involves holding the animals in a recovery area until they can be safely returned to nearby holding facilities. Several hours of clean-up following each surgery session are also required in the laboratories and support facilities to bring them to the level of cleanliness needed for the next surgery session.

The 36,821-gross-square-foot (20,620-assignable-square-foot) building would be a single-story, steel frame structure founded on spread footings. Walls would be constructed of concrete or concrete masonry and the foundation would be a concrete slab foundation. The facility would consolidate the small animal, large animal and food animal surgeries into one structure and would contain the following special-purpose areas:

Small Animal Surgery Suite. A small animal surgery room would include surgery tables and instruments and would be used to teach a variety of anesthesia, surgical and non-surgical courses in the curriculum of the SVM. The room would also be used to conduct Continuing Education courses for post-DVM training, resident training and classes for animal health technicians and animal technicians from other campus and non-campus units.

A small animal preparation and induction room would be used to anesthetize small animal patients and prepare the patients for surgery before moving the patients to the small animal surgery room. The room would also be used to instruct techniques of physical restraint, blood sample collection, and injections. A laboratory and dispensing pharmacy would be located within the interior of this room, which would be used to do blood work and dispense anesthetic drugs for patients.

Two radiology rooms would be constructed with appropriately shielding, rolling access to the small animal surgery room and with adequate room to accommodate a patient, transport cart, and students. These rooms would be used to process x-rays after they have been taken for radiographic diagnostic training purposes. The viewing room would be used to discuss radiographic findings. The equipment storage room would accommodate small animal equipment, gas anesthesia machines, ventilators, orthopedic equipment, and ultrasonography machines.

Large Animal Surgery Suite. The surgery rooms would include an overhead track system with roll-up door access to outside animal holding areas. The room would be used for instruction in

large animal surgery and anesthesia, as well as herd health, reproduction and food animal courses involving animals under general anesthesia, sedation and restraint of standing animals under sedation and local anesthesia, equine and food animal diagnostic procedures, and topographical anatomy. Two induction/recovery rooms fitted with "restraint gates" would be used for induction of, and recovery from, general anesthesia for horses, large ruminants and camelids (cattle, llamas, etc). The gates would provide for animal and personnel safety and ensure that other activities in the main surgical area are not disrupted.

Small and Large Animal Cold Storage and Freezer Storage. A cold room and freezer would be used to store small animal cadavers and body parts to be used in other surgical, teaching, or research activities. They would also function as an area for hazardous waste collection/pick-up and cadaver disposal. A second cold room and freezer would be used to store large animal cadavers and body parts collected throughout the year for use in surgery, and other courses. Equipment storage rooms would accommodate the hardware (ventilators, gas anesthesia machines, instrument tables, portable surgery table, and other ancillary equipment) necessary to conduct surgery classes.

Dentistry Preparation and Storage Room. This room would accommodate dentistry special equipment items that need to be kept separate from the general small animal equipment.

Scrub Room. This room would be used by students and instructors in preparation for donning surgical gowns and gloves used during surgical procedures. This room would also be used to instruct students and technicians in proper scrubbing, gowning and gloving techniques.

Surgical Support/Wrapping Room. This room would be used by students to sort instruments and make up surgical packs. The room would include a "pass through" window into a sterilizer room to submit packs for sterilization. The sterilizer room would serve multiple functions including sterilization of all instrument packs; preparation of specialty instrument packs; supply, drug, and suture dispensing; and processing and storage of specialty surgical instruments. The Supply Storage Room would store most disposables, chemicals, small instruments, and some equipment replacement and repair items.

Equipment/Machine Room. This room would house an oxygen manifold to supply piped oxygen to all three surgery rooms, the small animal preparation room and the large animal recovery rooms. This room would also have a system to remove excess anesthetic gases from anesthesia machines while they are in use. The air compressor used to drive the dentistry equipment and oxygen cylinders would also be installed in this room.

Other facilities. These would include locker rooms equipped with showers, changing areas, toilet stalls, washbasins, lockers and bench seating, a break room that would also serve as a conference room, and two offices that would accommodate support staff for the facilities.

Instructional Surgical Lecture Hall. The Instructional Surgical Lecture Hall would include 1,350 assignable square feet (2,411 gross square feet) of space with a seating capacity of 90. The space would accommodate regularly scheduled surgical course lectures as well as Extension and Continuing Education programs.

In the typical veterinary medicine instructional surgery course, students begin each laboratory session by assembling in a lecture hall where the instructor previews the surgery instructions and demonstrates, through slides, video and computer programs, the skills and techniques to be

3.1 CHANGES TO THE DRAFT EIR

As noted on pages 3-9 and 3-10 of the Draft EIR, the cumulative traffic analysis reported in the Draft EIR was based on a cumulative traffic analysis conducted for the USDA Western Human Nutrition Research Center project. That analysis was conducted in 1999 and took into account the level of population growth anticipated at that time for the Health Sciences District. Shortly before the issuance of the Draft EIR, the campus determined that the number of students, staff and faculty that would be traveling to the Health Sciences District would likely be greater than projected and analyzed in the 1999 study. Therefore another cumulative traffic analysis was undertaken in May 2000 to determine whether increased traffic to the District contributed by proposed and foreseeable projects could adversely affect the levels of service at study intersections.

Page 3-10 of the Draft EIR noted that the new traffic study was underway and stated that *“based upon preliminary review, no new significant cumulative impacts are expected to be identified in the new traffic analysis. In the event that the new analysis determines that level of service deteriorates at any intersection resulting in new significant impacts not previously analyzed, previously identified mitigation measures including physical intersection improvements, would be implemented in order to ensure the intersections operate at acceptable levels of service, as indicated by the UC Davis standards of significance.”*

Results of the new traffic study indicate that except for one intersection in the Health Sciences District (Hutchison Drive and Health Sciences Drive intersection), all intersections on- and off-campus would operate at a similar or better level of service than was projected in the 1999 traffic study. The new analysis indicates that the impact at the one affected intersection is attributable to other foreseeable projects and the proposed project would not contribute substantially to this impact. The proposed project would add 4 employees to a total of 750 employees and 36 new students to a total of 1,200 students in the Health Sciences District. In essence, should the other foreseeable projects not go forward, this cumulative impact would not occur due to the proposed project.

The new study also identified signalization of the affected intersection as a viable mitigation measure that would improve intersection operations to an acceptable level of service. The other foreseeable projects are at early stages of planning and environmental review. Even though the proposed project’s contribution to this impact is de minimis, given that this significant cumulative impact has been identified, the University has determined that it will adopt this mitigation measure as a part of its approval of the proposed Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory project. The mitigation measure for the cumulative traffic impact at the Hutchison Drive and Health Sciences Drive intersection is defined as noted below:

Project-Specific Mitigation Measure

- 3.1-2** The Campus will monitor traffic volumes at the Hutchison Drive and Health Sciences Drive intersection every three years. If and when signalization is warranted based on traffic volumes, the campus will install a new traffic signal at this location.

This information is hereby incorporated into the Draft EIR by reference. This new information is not considered significant new information that would necessitate the re-circulation of the Draft EIR for the following reasons: (1) the possibility of a new significant traffic impact was disclosed in the Draft EIR (page 3-11), (2) the University has committed to complying with a performance standard for level of service that would assure not significant impact, (3) no significant impacts have been identified that are associated with the proposed mitigation measure to meet this performance standard, (4) the new information relates to a cumulative impact which would not occur if other foreseeable projects are not approved, (5) the project's contribution to this cumulative impact is de minimis, and (6) a viable mitigation measure is available and within the jurisdiction of the campus to implement that would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation measure 3.1-2, adopted as part of this project, reduces a cumulative impact resulting from development under the 1994 LRDP and therefore revises the LRDP EIR. This revision is a minor change to the LRDP EIR and is considered an addendum that does not affect the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted as part of the Regents approval of the LRDP.

3.2 CHANGES TO THE INITIAL STUDY

As noted on page 78 of the Initial Study prepared for this project, the impact of increased campus operations, in conjunction with anticipated growth in the City of Davis, could contribute to the cumulative demand for emergency response capabilities in the Davis area. The Initial Study noted that this impact was considered significant and unavoidable in the LRDP EIR and therefore was also considered significant and unavoidable in the Initial Study. The LRDP EIR recommended implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.6-22(a), requiring adequate training and equipment for the campus emergency response team, to mitigate this impact. However, the LRDP EIR noted that the impact would remain significant and unavoidable because the University of California could not guarantee that the City of Davis and Yolo County would reach a Mutual Aid Agreement to provide first-response services both on campus and in the City and County. Since that time, the campus has implemented LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.6-22(a) and the City of Davis and Yolo County have entered into a Mutual Aid Agreement for emergency response services. Therefore, at this time the impact has been mitigated to a less-than-significant level and is no longer considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

CEQA requires that a lead agency establish a program for monitoring and reporting on mitigation measures adopted as part of the environmental review process. This MMRP is designed to ensure that, if the proposed project is approved, the mitigation measures identified in the Draft and Final EIRs will be implemented.

One project-specific mitigation measure has been included in the proposed project to address the level of service impact from cumulative development in the Health Sciences District. The mitigation monitoring program (Table 4-1) presents how that mitigation measure will be monitored for implementation. In addition, this Project incorporates relevant 1994 LRDP EIR mitigation measures previously adopted by The Regents implementation of these mitigation measures by this Project will be monitored pursuant to the existing 1994 LRDP EIR monitoring program previously adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 1994 LRDP EIR.

Table 4-1

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure	Monitoring and Reporting Procedure	Mitigation Timing	Mitigation Responsibility
3.1-2 The Campus will monitor traffic volumes at the Hutchison Drive and Health Sciences Driver Intersection every three years. If and when signalization is warranted based on traffic volumes, the Campus will install a new traffic signal at his location	Monitor the intersection. Review monitoring data to determine whether a signal is needed. Verify completion of new traffic signal when installed.	Every three years until the new signal is installed.	Transportation & Parking Services and Planning and Budget.