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Initial Study/Negative Declaration
Consumer Education Pavilion

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY

CEQA

The proposed Project for which this Initial Study and Negative Declaration has been prepared is the construction and operation of a Consumer Education Pavilion that would be located within the UC Davis School of Veterinary Medicine Teaching and Research Center (VMTRC) in Tulare, California. This document has been prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code 21000 et. seq. The University of California is the Lead Agency for this Project.

1.2 DETERMINATION

On the basis of the Initial Study, it has been determined that a Negative Declaration will be prepared.

2.0 PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

2.1 LOCATION

The VMTRC is located at 18830 Road 112, north of Avenue 184, east of State Highway 99, and south of Avenue 200 in the unincorporated area of Tulare County (see Figures 1 and 2). The VMTRC is approximately 400 acres in size. The site is a portion of Section 1, Township 21 South, Range 24 East, and a portion of Section 6, Township 21 South, Range 25 East, Mount Diablo Base and Meridian.

The proposed Consumer Education Pavilion (CEP) would be located on less than one acre within the VMTRC site, located north of the VMTRC Main Building and with access from Road 112 (see Figures 3 and 4 and Photoplates A, B and C). The total site will encompass approximately two acres, to accommodate a new septic system and drainage retention pond to serve the CEP.
2.2 SETTING AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

SETTING

**Consumer Education Pavilion (CEP) to be Located within Existing VMTRC**

The VMTRC is an integral part of the UC Davis School of Veterinary Medicine’s commitment to the efficient production of wholesome food from animal origin. The VMTRC’s personnel are responsible for field-oriented teaching, research, and public service programs in food animal medicine. Located in the heart of the San Joaquin Valley, the VMTRC has access to large commercial operations and abundant livestock populations, which are lacking in the Davis area. The VMTRC provides the Food Animal Production Medicine component for the veterinary school curriculum.

Completed in January 1983, the VMTRC’s facilities consist of approximately 31,000 square feet of laboratory, display area, office and clinical space on 30 acres within a total site of approximately 400 acres. The diagnostic and research laboratories have capabilities in immunology, molecular biology, pathology, microbiology, clinical pathology, clinical chemistry and parasitology, support teaching and research programs. The VMTRC also houses teaching areas, offices, a library, a small clinical unit, and limited student housing.

VMTRC provides physical facilities and support for the California Animal Health and Food Safety Laboratory (CAHFS), Tulare Branch. CAHFS provides state-funded diagnostic laboratory support to practicing veterinarians for livestock disease control as well as recognition and dissemination of new information on diseases, including those common to animals and humans.

VMTRC currently has 15 permanently based faculty members associated with the School of Veterinary Medicine Department of Population Health and Reproduction on the UC Davis campus. Approximately 60 other scientists, technical and administrative staff provide office, laboratory, computer, technical and maintenance support. UC Davis Department of Veterinary Medicine students, in selected clinical tracks, participate in two to eight week training programs at the VMTRC; the VMTRC offers two to four week instructional programs to selected senior veterinary students from other institutions in the United States and Canada as well.

The proposed CEP would be located on less than one acre within the VMTRC facility described above, immediately northwest of the existing VMTRC facility within an existing developed area. The site is currently used for vehicular turnarounds and overflow parking and has been completely disturbed.

**Project Description**

The proposed CEP includes the construction of a new building of approximately 4,800 gross square feet (GSF) (2,445 assignable square feet [ASF]) within the existing VMTRC. The CEP
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would provide dairy educational opportunities within the VMTRC by supporting the educational goals of the following three academic institutions: UC Davis, College of the Sequoias, and Tulare High School. The CEP would include a display and classroom area-type facility designed specifically for educational programs as they relate to state-of-the-art dairy and food safety programs.

The CEP would consist of one building and a parking lot. The building would contain a display area, an instructor’s office, an information technology control room, a storage room, and lobby/restroom facilities. These facilities are further described below.

**Display Area (2,000 ASF).** The display area would center around a small indoor classroom area. It would include tiered seating capable of holding 60 people in a classroom setting. A display area would be located at the front of this classroom where dairy cows and calves can be brought in for demonstrations to the assembled classes. This building would be the main display area for the VMTRC and for other programs requiring the use of small display area facilities. The display area would have an instructional podium with video capability, controlled lighting, voice and data communications and communication capability.

The arena portion would have a non-slip rubber floor with drainage, using either organic or inorganic bedding covering the concrete (bedding type would depend upon the use of the arena for each specific event). The arena would hold two to three dairy cattle at maximum. For frequency of intended use please see Operations section below.

**Information Technology Control Room/Office (75 ASF).** This room would be immediately adjacent to the display area and would be staffed by one employee. It would have a window for viewing the display area so that the operator could monitor activities in that room and provide the televideo, voice and computer presentations as necessary. This room would have numerous pieces of communication equipment and computers.

**Instructors’ Shared Office (215 ASF).** This office would be shared by two individuals for the purpose of providing temporary office space for the instructors using the CEP facilities. It would provide space for counseling of individual students, reviewing of class notes before a class presentation, accessing a computer, making phone calls or handling of administrative duties.

**Storage Room (155 ASF).** This storage room would be used to store instructional equipment and supplies used by the three participating programs.

**Parking Lot (8,500 SF).** The proposed parking area would contain 28 individual parking spaces and would include parking space for one bus.

**Septic System.** The CEP would be served by a new septic system for wastewater disposal including classroom washwater containing animal waste. The new septic system would utilize a storage tank of approximately 3,500 to 4,000 gallons and a leach field measuring approximately 45 feet by 110 feet. The leach field would be located northeast of the CEP building site.
Retention Basin. To provide adequate site drainage, the CEP would include a retention basin of approximately 0.5 acres in size with a depth of three to four feet. The retention basin would be located north of the proposed CEP building site.

Operations

The CEP would include the following uses and populations:

- Between 1,200 and 1,500 annual visitors would visit the facility as tour groups. These groups may attend classes or workshops within the facility.
- Between 125 and 150 high school or community college students would visit the facility during the school year as a part of their educational programs.
- Approximately 20 high school or community college students would train in the summer.
- Three to six UC Davis, School of Veterinary Medicine students and residents would attend classes or workshops at the CEP year-round.
- The veterinary medicine residents would be present at the facility all year except for reduced populations during vacations and summer break.
- Approximately 100 participants would visit the facility to attend continuing education classes.
- The existing VMTRC staff would run the classes, programs and workshops. Most staff members would live off the site within the surrounding community. One new employee would staff the CEP.
- The hours of operation would be 8:00 am-3:00 pm and occasional evenings.

3.0 CHECKLIST FORM AND INITIAL STUDY

1. Project Title:
   Consumer Education Pavilion (CEP)

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:
   Office of Resource Management and Planning
   University of California
   One Shields Avenue, 376 Mrak Hall
   Davis, CA 95616

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:
   Matt Dulcich
   Office of Resource Management and Planning
   UC Davis
   (530) 752-9597
4. **Project Location:**

   The proposed CEP would be located on approximately two acres of the VMTRC site, located north of the Main Building and with access from Road 112 (see Figure 3) in Tulare County.

5. **Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:**

   Office of Resource Management and Planning  
   University of California  
   One Shields Avenue, 376 Mrak Hall  
   Davis, CA 95616

6. **Location of Administrative Record for the Project:**

   Office of Resource Management and Planning  
   University of California  
   One Shields Avenue, 376 Mrak Hall  
   Davis, CA 95616

7. **Description of Project:**

   The CEP analyzed in this Initial Study would consist of one classroom building containing a display area, an instructor's office, an information technology control room, storage, lobby and restroom facilities, septic system and retention basin (complete Project Description is provided in Section 2.2).

8. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:**

   The Project site is adjacent to the existing Main Building of the VMTRC. Accessory structures and a parking lot are arranged to the south and east of the Project site (see Photoplate C). To the north of the Project site, on the other side of an existing fence, is an existing alfalfa field. To the west of the Project site is Road 112, a paved two-lane road which provides access to the site. The City of Tulare is located immediately north of the VMTRC site.

   Most surrounding land uses are agricultural uses and appear rural in character. The agricultural fields are used for crop production. Special use permits were approved by the County of Tulare for two new dairies adjacent to the VMTRC property, one immediately to the east and one to the south. The use permit for the dairy to the east has expired; the other dairy has not yet been constructed. A Kraft cheese plant is located on the west side of Highway 99, west of the VMTRC site. The Tulare Municipal Airport (Mefford Field) is located approximately two miles north of the Project site.
9. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)**

As the public agency principally responsible for approving or carrying out the proposed Project, the University of California is the Lead Agency under CEQA, and is responsible for reviewing and certifying the adequacy of this Initial Study. As a State entity, the University is not subject to local land use regulation. The UC Davis Facilities and Enterprise Policy Committee will consider approval of the Project under approval procedures delegated by the UC Board of Regents.

Health and safety permits from Tulare County and other agencies may be required for features such as septic system installation. If required, these permits would be obtained prior to building occupancy.

10. **Public Review Process**

The Draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration will be available for public and agency review from July 29, 2003 to August 27, 2003. Copies of the Draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration are available during normal operating hours at the UC Davis Office of Resource Management and Planning, 376 Mrak Hall on the UC Davis campus; at the VMTRC, 18830 Road 112, Tulare; at Reserves in Shields Library on the UC Davis campus; at the Tulare County Public Library, 200 West Oak Avenue, Visalia; and online at [www.ormp.ucdavis.edu/environreview/](http://www.ormp.ucdavis.edu/environreview/).

Comments should be e-mailed to environreview@ucdavis.edu or sent to:

John A. Meyer  
Vice Chancellor, Resource Management and Planning  
University of California  
One Shields Avenue  
376 Mrak Hall  
Davis, CA 95616

3.1 **ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this Project. As indicated by the checklist appearing on the following pages, this Initial Study has identified no significant impacts or potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Agricultural Resources</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Geology/Soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Hydrology/Water Quality</td>
<td>Land Use/Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Population/Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Transportation/Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities/Service Systems</td>
<td>Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

__X__ I find that the proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION would be prepared. A draft Negative Declaration is included as Appendix A of this Initial Study.

___ I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there would not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the Project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION would be prepared.

___ I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

___ I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a “potentially significant” impact or “potentially significant unless mitigated”. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

___ I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed Project, nothing further is required.

_____________________________      ____________________
Signature          Date
3.2 **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

The CEQA Environmental Checklist form is used to assist in evaluating the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. The checklist identifies potential project effects as follows:

1) Potentially Significant Impact: An effect that is substantial based on significance criteria. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries in the checklist form, an EIR is required.

2) Less-than-Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: An effect that, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, is reduced from a “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The Tiered Initial Study includes mitigation measures and briefly explains how these measures reduce the associated effect to a less than significant level.

3) Less than Significant Impact: No significant impacts, only less-than-significant impacts, will result.

4) No Impact: The project does not create an impact in the category.

Included in each discussion is a summary of relevant setting information that applies to the proposed projects. Substantiation and clarification for each checklist response is also provided in the following resource discussions.

Following the environmental checklist, Section 4.0 contains a Discussion of Checklist Findings to explain the items indicated in the checklist. The discussion in Section 4.0 provides the reader with site specific information on the potential for the environmental impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues :</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I. **AESTHETICS. Would the Project:**

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  
   x

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?  
   x

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  
   x
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. **AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES.** *Would the Project:*

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

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. **AIR QUALITY.** *Would the proposal:*

a) Conflict with or obstruct incorporation of the applicable air quality plan?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Violate any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or Projected air quality violation?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.** *Would the Project:*

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either
Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 or the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the Project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | | | X |

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological
resource pursuant to §15064.5?

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?  

   x

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?  

   x

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. *Would the Project:*

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

   i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.  

   x

   ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?  

   x

   iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?  

   x

   iv) Landslides?  

   x

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  

   x

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

   x

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

   x

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems?  

   x
Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the Project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?

   X

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

   X

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

   X

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

   X

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

   X

f) For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?

   X

g) Impair incorporation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

   X
**Issues:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the Project:**

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Project:

a) Physically divide an established community? | x |

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

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | x |

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the Project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | x |

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? | x |
XI. NOISE. Would the Project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?  

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?  

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?  

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?  

e) For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?  

f) For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?  

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the Project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?  

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?  

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. *Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:*

a) Fire protection? \[x\]

b) Police protection? \[x\]

c) Schools? \[x\]

d) Parks? \[x\]

e) Other public facilities and services? \[x\]

XIV. RECREATION.

a) Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? \[x\]

b) Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? \[x\]

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. *Would the Project:*

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? \[x\]

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? \[x\]
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?  

x

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?  

x

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?  

x

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?  

x

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?  

x

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. *Would the Project:*  

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?  

x

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?  

x

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?  

x

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  

x

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project’s Projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?  

x
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? x

b) Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (cumulatively considerable means that the incremental effects of a Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past Projects, the effects of other current Projects, and the effects of probable future Projects)? x

c) Does the Project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? x
4.0 DISCUSSION OF CHECKLIST FINDINGS

I. AESTHETICS: Would the Project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

   No Impact

   The CEP Project site is located within the existing VMTRC facility. The Project
would simply add one more building to an existing complex of buildings. No scenic
vistas have been identified. No impact has been identified.

b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock
   outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

   No Impact

   State Highway 99 does not have a State scenic highway designation. No scenic
resources have been identified on the Project site. No impact has been identified.

c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its
   surroundings?

   No impact.

   See Item I(a) above.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect
   day or nighttime views in the area?

   Less Than Significant

   The Project site would include exterior structure lighting as well as perimeter lighting
for purposes of security and visibility. Lighting would be consistent with other
buildings in the area and with established UC architectural criteria requiring
downward-directed lighting. Surrounding uses are agricultural and are not considered
sensitive uses. Therefore, Project-related exterior lighting would have a less than
significant impact.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the Project:

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

*No Impact*

The CEP and the majority of the VMTRC are designated as “Irrigated Farmland,” with the remainder of the VMTRC site designated “Grazing Land” and “Other Land” on the 1998 Tulare County Interim Farmland Map (California Department of Conservation). “Irrigated Farmland” is defined as “Cropped land with a developed irrigation water supply that is dependable and of adequate quality. Land must have been used for production of irrigated crops at some time during the two update cycles prior to the mapping date.” This part of the Tulare County map is an interim map because of the lack of a modern soil survey. The Department of Conservation has indicated that without the soils information, they cannot map the categories of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland and Farmland of Local Importance.

The proposed Project area has already been converted from farmland to a driveway turnaround and overflow parking area within the existing VMTRC complex. Therefore, there would be *no impact* associated with the construction and operation of the CEP related to conversion of farmland.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

*No Impact*

As a State entity, the University is not subject to local land use regulations such as zoning. However, according to the Tulare County Zoning Ordinance, the Project site is zoned for agricultural use. The proposed Project is consistent with agricultural zoning and does not conflict with a Williamson Act contract. The Williamson Act does not apply to properties owned by the State. Any nearby lands subject to Williamson Act provisions would not be affected by the proposed project. *No impact* has been identified.

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

*No Impact*

See Item II(a). The proposed Project is an agricultural related use. The proposed Project will benefit agricultural land uses by contributing to the teaching and education of agricultural resources. The Project will not induce growth or cause the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use. *No impact* has been identified.
III. **AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:**

a) **Conflict with or obstruct incorporation of the applicable air quality plan?**

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The United States Environmental Protection Agency and the California Air Resources Board has designated the air quality of the San Joaquin Valley as severe non-attainment for ozone \((O_3)\) and small-diameter particulate matter \((PM10)\). The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) has established a three-tiered approach to determining significance related to a project’s quantified ozone precursor emissions. Each tier or level requires a different degree of complexity of emissions calculation and modeling to determine air quality significance. The SJVAPCD pre-calculated the emissions on a large number and types of projects to identify the level at which they have no possibility of exceeding emissions thresholds. The District’s Guide for Assessing Air Quality Impacts provides this information in terms of vehicle trips required to exceed the threshold for five general land use categories (residential housing, commercial, office, institutional and industrial) and the sizes of various specific development types meeting these criteria.

Projects falling under these size thresholds qualify for what the SJVAPCD refers to as the Small Project Analysis Level (SPAL). The proposed CEP Project falls under the SPAL threshold. No quantification of ozone precursor emissions is needed for projects less than or equal to the sizes listed. Also, the average daily trips (ADT) for the proposed Project would be far below the thresholds established for any of the five land use categories (the lowest thresholds of which all exceed 1,000 trips/day). Air quality impacts resulting from the Project would be considered *less than significant.*

The proposed CEP is an educational facility that would not emit toxic air contaminants, hazardous materials, asbestos or odors that exceed adopted standards. Routine cleaning materials such as chlorine and other disinfectants will be used in small amounts that are not considered toxic or hazardous. Although toxic materials could be used in construction, none are expected because this Project is a simple classroom building. The maximum number of cows within the facility at any given time would be three, with the usual number being one.

Although the odor associated with the cow(s) may be annoying to some within the facility, it would have *no impact* on any air quality plan. The same is true for the minor release of ammonia associated with the waste of one or two cows. Cows will only be present at the facility on an intermittent basis; none would be housed at the CEP.

Particulate matter emissions would occur during the construction phase from construction activities. The District’s Regulation VIII (Fugitive Dust Prohibitions) will apply during construction. These rules regulate construction and excavation...
(Rule 8020), handling and storage of bulk materials (Rule 8030), paved and unpaved construction roads (Rule 8060), and parking, transfer, fueling and service areas (Rule 8070). The University would require compliance with these rules as a condition of the CEP construction contract. Though a potentially significant effect could occur in the absence of existing regulatory controls, compliance with the District’s Regulation VIII (Fugitive Dust Prohibitions) would reduce any construction dust emissions to a less than significant level.

b) Violate any air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less Than Significant Impact

Refer to Item III(a) above.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Less Than Significant Impact

Refer to Item III(a) above.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

No Impact

No substantial pollutant concentrations are currently occurring on, around or near the proposed site. No laboratories will be included in the proposed CEP. The proposed Project would not result in substantial pollutant emissions; no impact would occur.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact

Refer to Items III(a) and III(d) above.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the Project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
No Impact

The development of a totally disturbed driveway turnaround and overflow parking area immediately adjacent to the existing VMTRC would have a no impact to foraging raptors or any other potential special-status species in the area. Therefore, the Project would have no impact to sensitive or special status species.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact

There is no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified on the Project site.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 or the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No Impact

There is no wetland habitat identified on the Project site.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

No Impact

The Project site is on the valley floor and no migratory wildlife corridors have been identified.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No Impact

There are no trees or other vegetation on the Project site that are protected by local policies or ordinances. Refer to Items IV(b) above and IV(f) below. No impact has been identified.
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact

There is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan that applies to the Project site. No impact has been identified.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the Project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

No Impact

The Project site is currently used as a turnaround and overflow parking lot for existing structures within the VMTRC, and no structures are located on the site. A cultural resources survey was conducted by Applied Earthworks, Inc. (September 1998) for the Project site, and no historical resources were identified.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact

Applied Earthworks, Inc. conducted a cultural resources survey for the Project site (September 1998). No known cultural resources or ethnic cultural sites were identified in the Project area, and no adverse effects to ethnic cultural values are expected. Though the majority of the Project site has been disturbed by previous agricultural activities and is presently used as a vehicle turnaround and overflow parking area, grading and excavation for the proposed building could result in the disturbance of previously unknown archaeological resources. Therefore, the following mitigation measure is recommended to further reduce the potential effect of the less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measure #1: Should ground-disturbing activities associated with construction reveal the presence of cultural resources (i.e., artifact concentrations, including arrowheads and other stone tools or chipping debris, cans, glass, etc.; structural remains; human skeletal remains) or any paleontological or unique geological resources, work within 50 feet of the find shall cease immediately until a qualified professional archaeologist can be consulted to evaluate the artifacts or remains and implement appropriate mitigation procedures. Should human skeletal remains be encountered, State law requires immediate notification of the Tulare
County Coroner. Should the County Coroner determine that such remains are in an archaeological context, the Native American Heritage Commission in Sacramento shall be notified immediately to arrange for Native American participation in deciding the disposition of such remains.

c) **Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?**

*Less Than Significant Impact*

Refer to Item V(b) above.

d) **Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

*Less Than Significant Impact*

Although no evidence was found on the surface of the Project area, there is still a possibility of human remains being uncovered in the area during construction. Mitigation Measure #1 in Item V(b) would further reduce the potential effect of this *less than significant impact*.

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the Project:**

a) **Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

*Less Than Significant Impact*

According to the Five County Seismic Safety Element, an element of the Tulare County General Plan, and the Division of Mines Special Publication 42, there are no active faults in the five-county area (which includes Fresno, Kings, Madera, Mariposa and Tulare counties). The Project site is within Seismic Zone V1, which is considered a low hazard area. This impact is therefore considered *less than significant*.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

*Less Than Significant Impact*
According to the Five County Seismic Safety Element, Seismic Zone V1 is considered to have a low hazard for seismic ground shaking; the Project is required to comply with the Uniform Building Code, therefore, the low potential for seismic ground shaking is considered less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

*Less Than Significant Impact*

According to the Five County Seismic Safety Element, Seismic Zone V1 is considered to have a low hazard for liquefaction, and this hazard is considered less than significant.

iv) Landslides?

*No Impact*

The Project site is flat and has no potential for a landslide. Therefore, no impact would occur.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

*Less Than Significant Impact*

The portion of the Project site where construction is proposed is flat, has been used as a vehicle turnaround and overflow parking area, and contains no natural watercourses. Erosion is not listed as a potential hazard in 1997 unpublished soil survey information provided by the Natural Resources Conservation Service. This impact is therefore considered less than significant.

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

*Less Than Significant Impact*

According to the Five County Seismic Safety Element, Seismic Zone V1 is considered to have a low to moderate hazard for subsidence/settlement, low hazard for liquefaction, and minimal hazard for landslides, and these hazards are considered less than significant. Crosscreek-Kai Association soils, such as those on-site, are loamy with silica and calcium carbonate duripan. The risk of subsidence is considered to be very low. This impact is therefore considered less than significant.
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

*Less Than Significant Impact*

According to 1997 unpublished soil survey information provided by the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the shrink-swell potential of Crosscreek-Kai soils is moderate. This soil characteristic is not listed as a building site development limitation. Compliance with Uniform Building Code standards will assure that any impacts of expansive soils are *less than significant*.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

*Less Than Significant Impact*

A septic system will provide for human and animal wastewater disposal needs on the Project site. According to the 1997 unpublished soil survey information provided by the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the very slow permeability of on-site soils increases the possibility that improperly designed septic tank absorption fields could fail, and on-site investigation is needed when septic systems are designed. This impact is considered *less than significant* because the University will design the septic system to meet all Uniform Building Code and Uniform Plumbing Code requirements, and will complete the Tulare County Health and Human Service Agency septic system permit process prior to septic system installation.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. *Would the Project:*

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?

*Less Than Significant Impact*

The only hazardous chemicals the CEP will bring to the site are common chemicals used for routine janitorial and maintenance activities. Some hazardous chemicals such as chlorine are commonly used for facility cleaning as disinfectants. The proposed Project would not involve increased transportation of hazardous materials to, from, or within the VMTRC that could expose people to potential health and safety risks as a result of an accidental release. The campus Environmental Health and Safety Office (EH&S) performs mandatory compliance functions related to health, safety, and environmental issues and is the primary contact for local, state, and federal agencies to inform the UC Davis community of regulatory requirements and to perform mandatory compliance functions related to health. Adherence to EH&S
practices at the VMTRC for handling hazardous materials and hazardous wastes will assure that impacts remain less than significant.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

No Impact

The proposed CEP would not involve increased use of hazardous materials that could expose people to potential health and safety risks as a result of an accidental release into the environment. The CEP would include no use of biohazardous materials. No impacts are expected.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed Project is an educational center for dairy technology on the existing VMTRC campus. Standard disinfectants, such as chlorine, would be used for routine maintenance of the facility. The Project site is not within one quarter mile of an existing elementary, middle, or high school. As concluded in Items VII(a) and (b) above, potential impacts would be less than significant.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No Impact

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, the following databases were consulted:

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
CERCLIS Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Information System (CERCLIS)
NPL National Priority List (NPL),
NFRAP No Further Remedial Action Planned Sites (NFRAP),
MSWLF Municipal Solid Waste Landfills MSWLF, and the
LUST Leaking Underground Storage Tanks

This search for onsite hazardous materials revealed that the Project site is not included on any list of hazardous materials sites that would create a significant hazard to the public or environment. *No impact* has been identified.

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

*Less Than Significant Impact*

The Project would create a new source of light which could potentially affect adjacent airport uses. The CEP site is located approximately one mile south of the Tulare Municipal Airport (Mefford Field), a general aviation public airport. Lighting would be consistent with other buildings in the area and would be downward-directed in orientation and would not create a hazard. Impacts associated with lighting as a safety hazard for airport operations are therefore considered *less than significant.*

f) For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?

*No Impact*

The Project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. *No impact* has been identified.

g) Impair incorporation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

*No Impact*

The Project would not affect any roadways, change emergency access or access to nearby uses. *No impact* has been identified.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

*No Impact*

The Project site is surrounded by irrigated agriculture fields and has no potential to increase fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass or trees.
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the Project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

*Less Than Significant Impact*

The Project would accommodate only one to three cows on site intermittently, and none would be housed at the CEP. Therefore, the potential impact to surface and groundwater nitrate levels is *less than significant.*

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

*Less Than Significant Impact*

The site is served by an existing onsite well that has demonstrated capacity through well pump test data to be able to provide adequate water supply to the proposed CEP. Water will only be needed for restrooms, drinking water and cleaning purposes. If the CEP includes a fire prevention sprinkler system, a second well or a pressurized water tank may be needed. A fire prevention sprinkler system is not required to meet building code standards but is being considered for the CEP. Additional water consumption during a fire would not deplete groundwater supplies because such use would be highly infrequent and of a short duration. Therefore, the potential impact to local groundwater resources would be *less than significant.*

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

*No Impact*

The proposed Project does not involve the redirection or modification of any major surface drainage patterns, and will not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. *No impact* has been identified.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

*Less Than Significant Impact*
The proposed Project does not involve the redirection or modification of any major surface drainage patterns. There are no drainage channels internal to the site. There will, therefore, be no effect on drainage patterns or the amount of surface water in any water body.

Construction of the building and parking lot would result in additional coverage of the Project site with new impervious surfaces. Stormwater drainage from these areas will be conveyed to the on-site retention pond. No additional drainage will reach onsite or regional waterways as a result of the Project. No changes to the rate or amount of runoff would occur. This potential impact is therefore less than significant.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

Because the total Project site is larger than one acre, it is subject to the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) for construction Best Management Practices (BMPs). The University will file a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board to comply with the Statewide General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity. To comply with the General Permit, the University will require the contractor to prepare and implement a site-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Standard contract specification 01351 – Storm Water Pollution Prevention sets forth the specific requirements for the contractor by the University. This impact is considered less than significant.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

Refer to Item VIII(e). This impact is considered less than significant.

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

**No Impact**

According to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM), approximately 60 acres of the most southerly portion of the 400 acre VMTRC is delineated as being in Flood Zone A, a 100-year flood zone. The proposed Project does not include any housing; therefore, no impact has been identified.
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

*Less Than Significant*

Refer to Item VIII (g). The proposed CEP site is located in Flood Zone A and is within the 100-year flood hazard area. The placement of the CEP would create impervious surface that would add a small amount of flow water. The site would be graded to drain to the proposed retention pond. No stormwater flow would be redirected to an off-site location. Therefore, the potential impact of impeding or redirecting flows would be *less than significant*.

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

*Less Than Significant Impact*

Should the Kaweah Dam on the Tule River fail, the Project site is located within an inundation area. According to a July, 1998 Dam Failure Inundation Map, the proposed CEP Project site would be located within an 8 to 12 hour time zone, allowing this amount of time for evacuation of the facilities. Chances of dam failure are minimal, and should it occur, evacuation time is plentiful; therefore, the impact is *less than significant*.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

*No Impact*

A seiche is a seismically-induced wave in a reservoir, lake or harbor. Seiches have the potential to damage shoreline structures, dams and levees. As discussed in Items VI(a) and VI(c) above, the Project site is not prone to significant geologic or seismic activity which would trigger inundation of the proposed Project site by water or mud. *No impact* has been identified.

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Project:**

a) Physically divide an established community?

*No Impact*

The proposed Project consists of the construction and operation of a teaching and research facility on a site already used for agricultural and educational purposes, in an area characterized by agriculture and dairies. It is an extension of the existing uses of the site. There is no residential community in the vicinity of the Project site. This
Project does not alter existing land uses and would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. *No impact* has been identified.

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

*No Impact*

The University, as a State entity, is not subject to municipal land use regulations. Nevertheless, the Project would not conflict with the Tulare County General Plan.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

*No Impact*

Refer to Item IV(f). *No impact* has been identified.

X. **MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the Project:**

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

*No Impact*

Construction of the proposed Project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State. *No impact* has been identified.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

*No Impact*

The Tulare County General Plan does not identify the Project site as a mineral resource recovery site. *No impact* has been identified.

XI. **NOISE. Would the Project result in:**

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
**Less Than Significant Impact**

The campus typically considers residential and institutional land uses to be noise sensitive. No residential land uses would be affected by the proposed project. Institutional land uses such as the existing VMTRC or the proposed CEP could experience increased traffic-related noise levels. The expected increase would be minimal because of the small increase in traffic associated with the site, and because the site traffic would be slow and therefore not produce significant noise near the CEP.

The Noise Element of the Tulare County General Plan establishes land use compatibility standards and noise level criteria to be applied to land uses other than residential or other noise-sensitive uses. For schools, noise levels up to 70 deciBels (dB) L_{dn} (day-night noise level) or 70 dB CNEL (Community noise equivalent level) are considered normally acceptable. As noted above, traffic noise levels averaged over a 24-hour period will be low, and the facility itself will not generate noise that exceeds these standards. Therefore, potential impacts associated with noise related to the proposed Project are considered less than significant.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

Excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels are not anticipated during either construction or operation of the Project. Construction will entail use of equipment and techniques prevalent throughout the region, and will be temporary in nature. This impact is therefore considered less than significant.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

Refer to Item XI(a) above. Noise generated by the proposed Project will be related to the display area activities. This impact is therefore less than significant.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?

**Less Than Significant Impact**

Refer to Item XI(a) above.
e) For a Project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?

Less Than Significant Impact

The Project site is located approximately 1 mile south of the Tulare Municipal Airport (Mefford Field). Airport related noise levels for the Project site fall within the 60 dB noise contour for the Airport. According to the Tulare County Noise Element, community noise exposure for agricultural sites is normally acceptable up to 75 dB. This impact is therefore considered less than significant.

f) For a Project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact

The Project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact has been identified.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the Project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

No Impact

The proposed Project will not require extension of infrastructure to serve the Project site, and will not induce population growth in the area. Only one additional faculty member would be added from outside the area. Therefore, no impact has been identified.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact

No housing will be displaced as a result of the proposed project. No impact has been identified.
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact

Refer to Item XII(b) above.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact

The Tulare County Fire Department provides fire protection and first responder emergency medical aid services to all unincorporated areas in the County. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection responds to all fires and calls not covered by city governments, county governments, USFS and BLM. The Tulare County Fire Department has 8 field battalions in the County. The Tulare Fire Station number 25 (located in battalion 16) is approximately 8 miles from the Project site and would be the first to respond to an emergency.

The Tulare Westside Fire Station is approximately 7 miles from the Project site and would respond to an emergency if the Tulare Fire Station were unable to respond. With two fire stations able to respond to an emergency at the Project site with the same type of service they already provide throughout the County, the potential impacts to fire protection from this Project are considered to be less than significant.

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact

The Tulare Police Department is located at 260 South M Street and is approximately 9 miles from the Project site and already services the VMTRC complex. The department has 50 sworn officers, including nine investigators. In addition to its patrol, investigation and traffic safety functions, the department has an active community-based policing program. The Tulare County Sheriff’s Department, located at the County Civic Center in Visalia, would also provide police protection to the Project site. The County Sheriff’s Department currently employs 551 full-time peace officers with 212 non-peace officers. The County Sheriff’s Department has already established patrol routes in the vicinity of the VMTRC and will continue with these patrol routes. The Project would generate only minimal calls for service, and a
responsible party is on-site at all times. Therefore, with both the County and City police departments fully equipped and staffed, impacts of police protection for the Project site are considered less than significant.

c) Schools?

No Impact

The proposed Project would expand and benefit the curriculum of Tulare High School and College of the Sequoias, as well as the VMTRC. Only one faculty member is anticipated to relocate from out of the area. The VMTRC maintains its own library on-site. No adverse impact to local schools or libraries has been identified.

d) Parks?

No Impact

The proposed Project would have no impact on local parks and would not create demand for additional parks. No significant increase in population is expected to result from the proposed Project. No impact has been identified.

e) Other public facilities?

No Impact

The proposed Project would have no impact on local medical facilities, County government facilities, or other public facilities.

XIV. RECREATION.

a) Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

No Impact

The proposed Project would have no impact on local parks and would not create demand for additional parks. No significant increase in population is expected to result from the proposed Project. No impact has been identified.

b) Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?


No Impact

The proposed Project does not include recreational facilities and does not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Refer to Item XIV(a) above. No impact has been identified.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the Project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

Less Than Significant Impact

Road 112 is an existing two lane paved rural County road and would provide access to the Project site. Due to the agricultural nature of the surrounding area, Road 112 is characterized by low traffic volumes. In addition, only limited new traffic would be generated by the proposed Project, related to use of the facility by school tour groups, high school students, community college students, and one additional faculty member. Therefore, the potential impact of an increase in traffic would be less than significant.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Less Than Significant Impact

Refer to Item XV(a) above.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

No Impact

The proposed Project does not involve and will have no effect on air traffic. The Project site is located approximately one mile south of the Tulare Municipal Airport (Mefford Field), a general aviation airport, but would not affect airport operations. Maximum building height would be approximately 25 feet and would not interfere with air traffic. No impact has been identified.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?
No Impact

The Project includes no design features that are hazards and does not introduce any new incompatible uses. The Project incorporates an entry driveway and an exit driveway to allow sufficient visibility for drivers exiting onto Road 112. Therefore, there would be no impact.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact

There is no potential for the proposed Project to result in inadequate emergency access. The Project will provide adequate access to the site, as described in Item XV(a) above.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

Less Than Significant Impact

Approximately 28 parking spaces would be provided at the CEP facility plus a space for one tour bus. Based on the number of facility users, as stated in Item XV(a) above, parking for the proposed Project would be adequate. This impact is therefore considered less than significant.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

No Impact

Road 112 does not provide a bike lane nor is one planned. The Project site is very rural and few pedestrians or bicyclists would be present, except on the Project site itself. The proposed Project has no potential to increase conflicts between bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit vehicles, causing increased congestion and safety problems. As an agricultural use, the proposed Project has no potential to conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation or increase demand for transit services.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the Project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Less Than Significant Impact

Refer to Item VIII(a) above.
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

*Less Than Significant Impact*

A new septic system will be installed onsite for human and animal waste. See Item VI(e). This impact is considered *less than significant.*

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

*Less Than Significant Impact*

The proposed Project does not involve the redirection or modification of any major surface drainage patterns. There are no drainage channels internal to the site. There will, therefore, be no effect on drainage patterns or the amount of surface water in any water body.

Construction of the building and parking lot would result in additional coverage of the Project site with new impervious surfaces. Stormwater drainage from these areas will be conveyed to the on-site retention pond. The retention pond will be designed to prevent site flooding, and construction of the retention pond would consist of grading and earth moving, which would not result in significant environmental effects. No additional drainage will reach onsite or regional waterways as a result of the Project. No changes to the rate or amount of runoff would occur. This potential impact is therefore *less than significant.*

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

*Less Than Significant Impact*

The Project would not be dependent upon water entitlements. Water would be obtained from on-site wells. The impact is therefore considered *less than significant.*

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

*No Impact*

Wastewater treatment would be provided by the proposed onsite septic system; there is no wastewater treatment provider. *No impact* has been identified.
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project’s solid waste disposal needs?

_Less Than Significant Impact_

The private contractor that currently provides service to the VMTRC would provide solid waste disposal for the Project. Tulare County has recently approved expansion of the Woodville landfill, which would provide sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate County solid waste disposal needs for many years. This impact is considered _less than significant._

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

_Less Than Significant Impact_

Refer to Item XVI(f) above.

_XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE._

a) Does the Project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

_Less Than Significant Impact_

The Project would result in _less than significant_ impacts to endangered, rare or threatened species. The proposed Project would have a _less than significant_ potential impact to examples of California history and prehistory. Proposed mitigation would further reduce potential impacts.

b) Does the Project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable (cumulatively considerable means that the incremental effects of a Project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past Projects, the effects of other current Projects, and the effects of probable future Projects)?

_Less Than Significant Impact_

This Project would result in _less than significant cumulative impacts_ on particulate emissions due to construction activities.
c) Does the Project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

*Less Than Significant Impact*

All identified environmental effects on human beings would be *less than significant.*
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Appendix A
Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA), Public Resources Code 21000 et seq. and the State CEQA guidelines, the University of California, Davis has prepared an Initial Study that identifies potential impacts resulting from the project which are described below.

**Proponent:** University of California, Davis

**Project:** Consumer Education Pavilion

**Location:** The project site is located adjacent to the existing UC Davis Veterinary Medicine Teaching and Research Center (VMTRC), 18830 Road 112, Tulare, Tulare County, California.

**Description of the Proposed Project**

The proposed project is the construction of a 4,800 gross square feet (2,445 assignable square feet) Consumer Education Pavilion in Tulare County, including a display area/show arena, information technology control room/office, instructors’ shared office, storage room, parking lot, septic system and retention basin. The CEP will include a display and classroom area facility designed for educational programs as they relate to state-of-the-art dairy and food safety programs.

**Determination**

In accordance with CEQA, an Initial Study has been prepared by UC Davis that evaluates the environmental effects of the proposed project. On the basis of the project’s Initial Study, the campus found that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment. As analyzed in the Initial Study, there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, preparation of an environmental impact report is not required.

**Public Review**

In accordance with Section 15073 of the CEQA Guidelines, the Draft Initial Study for the project was circulated for public and agency review from July 29, 2003 to August 27, 2003.
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