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1 PROJECT INFORMATION

Project title:

King Hall Renovation and Expansion

Project location:

University of California, Davis
Yolo County

Lead agency’s name and address:

Office of Resource Management and Planning
University of California
One Shields Avenue
376 Mrak Hall
Davis, CA 95616-8678

Contact person:

A. Sidney England, Director of Environmental Planning, 530-752-2432

Project sponsor’s name and address:

See lead agency.

Location of administrative record:

See lead agency.

Identification of previous documents relied upon for tiering purposes:

This environmental analysis is tiered from the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the UC Davis 2003 Long Range Development Plan (2003 LRDP) (State Clearinghouse No. 2002102092). The 2003 LRDP is a comprehensive land use plan that guides physical development on campus to accommodate projected enrollment increases and expanded and new program initiatives through the 2015-16 academic year. Section 2.2 provides additional information about the tiering process. The 2003 LRDP and its EIR are available for review at the following locations:

- UC Davis Office of Resource Management and Planning in 376 Mrak Hall on the UC Davis campus
- Reserves at Shields Library on the UC Davis campus
- Yolo County Public Library at 315 East 14th Street in Davis
- Online at http://www.ormp.ucdavis.edu/environreview/
2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 INITIAL STUDY

Pursuant to Section 15063 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Sections 15000 et seq.), an Initial Study is a preliminary environmental analysis that is used by the lead agency as a basis for determining whether an EIR, a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or a Negative Declaration is required for a project. The CEQA Guidelines require that an Initial Study contain a project description, description of environmental setting, identification of environmental effects by checklist or other similar form, explanation of environmental effects, discussion of mitigation for significant environmental effects, evaluation of the project’s consistency with existing, applicable land use controls, and the name of persons who prepared the study.

2.2 TIERING PROCESS

This environmental analysis is a Tiered Initial Study for the proposed King Hall Renovation and Expansion project (referred to as the “proposed project” throughout this document). This environmental analysis is tiered from the UC Davis 2003 LRDP EIR in accordance with Sections 15152 and 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines and Public Resources Code Section 21094. The 2003 LRDP EIR is a Program EIR that was prepared pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines. The 2003 LRDP is a comprehensive land use plan that guides physical development on campus to accommodate projected enrollment increases and expanded and new program initiatives through the 2015-16 academic year. The 2003 LRDP EIR analyzes full implementation of uses and physical development proposed under the 2003 LRDP, and it identifies measures to mitigate the significant adverse program-level and cumulative impacts associated with that growth. The proposed project is an element of the growth that was anticipated in the 2003 LRDP and evaluated in the 2003 LRDP EIR.

The CEQA concept of "tiering" refers to the evaluation of general environmental matters in a broad program-level EIR, with subsequent focused environmental documents for individual projects that implement the program. This environmental document incorporates by reference the discussions in the 2003 LRDP EIR (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.

Section 15168(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines provides for simplifying the preparation of environmental documents on individual parts of the program by incorporating by reference analyses and discussions that apply to the program as a whole. Where an EIR has been prepared or certified for a program or plan, the environmental review for a later activity consistent with the program or plan should be limited to effects that were not analyzed as significant in the prior EIR or that are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance (CEQA Guidelines Section 15152[d]).

Accordingly, the tiering of the environmental analysis for the proposed project allows this Tiered Initial Study to rely on the 2003 LRDP EIR for the following:

- a discussion of general background and setting information for environmental topic areas;
- overall growth-related issues;
• issues that were evaluated in sufficient detail in the 2003 LRDP EIR for which there is no significant new information or change in circumstances that would require further analysis; and

• assessment of cumulative impacts.

The purpose of this Tiered Initial Study is to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project with respect to the 2003 LRDP EIR to determine what level of additional environmental review, if any, is appropriate. As shown in the Determination in Section 6 of this document, and based on the analysis contained in this Tiered Initial Study, it has been determined that the proposed project would not result in any potentially significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant levels or are not sufficiently addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR. The analysis contained in this Tiered Initial Study concludes that the proposed project would result in the following categories of impacts, depending on the environmental issue involved: no impact; less-than-significant impact; less-than-significant impact with the implementation of 2003 LRDP EIR or project-specific mitigation measures; or contribution to a significant and unavoidable impact that was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR for which no new mitigation measures are available and no new analysis is proposed. The project would not result in new potentially significant impacts that were not previously identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR. Therefore, preparation of a Negative Declaration is appropriate (the Negative Declaration is presented in Appendix A).

This Initial Study concludes that the project impacts are addressed by the measures that have been adopted as part of the approval of the 2003 LRDP. Therefore, those 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures that are related to, and may reduce the impacts of, this project will be identified in this Initial Study. Since these mitigation measures are already being carried out as part of implementation of the 2003 LRDP, they will not be readopted. The benefits of these mitigation measures will be achieved independently of considering them as specific mitigation measures of this project. Nothing in this Initial Study in any way alters the obligations of the campus to implement the LRDP mitigation measures.

This Tiered Initial Study includes only minor technical changes or additions to the analysis set forth in the 2003 LRDP EIR, and it does not raise important new issues about the significant effects on the environment analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR. None of the conditions described in CEQA or the CEQA Guidelines calling for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR have occurred.

2.3 Public and Agency Review

This Draft Tiered Initial Study was circulated for public and agency review from September 8, 2006 to October 9, 2006. Copies of this document, the 2003 LRDP, and the 2003 LRDP EIR were available for review at the following locations:

• UC Davis Office of Resource Management and Planning in 376 Mrak Hall on the UC Davis campus
• Reserves at Shields Library on the UC Davis campus
• Yolo County Public Library at 315 East 14th Street in Davis
• Online at http://www.ormp.ucdavis.edu/environreview/

Comments on this Draft Tiered Initial Study were required by 5:00 PM on October 9, 2006 and could have been e-mailed to environreview@ucdavis.edu or sent to:
Comments received are presented in Appendix B, along with responses to each comment.

2.4 Project Approvals

As a 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 the environmental document and approving the proposed project. It is anticipated that The Board of Regents of the University of California (The Regents) will consider approval of the proposed project in November 2006.

2.5 Organization of the Tiered Initial Study

This Tiered Initial Study is organized into the following sections:

Section 1 – Project Information: provides summary background information about the proposed project, including project location, lead agency, and contact information.

Section 2 – Introduction: summarizes the Tiered Initial Study's relationship to the 2003 LRDP EIR, the scope of the document, the project's review and approval processes, and the document's organization.

Section 3 – Project Description: includes a description of the proposed project, including the need for the project, the project’s objectives, and the elements included in the project.

Section 4 – Consistency with the 2003 LRDP: describes the consistency of the proposed project with the 2003 LRDP and 2003 LRDP EIR.

Section 5 – Environmental Factors Potentially Affected: identifies which environmental factors, if any, involve at least one significant or potentially significant impact that has not been previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Section 6 – Determination: indicates whether impacts associated with the proposed project are significant, and what, if any, additional environmental documentation is required.

Section 7 – Evaluation of Environmental Impacts: contains the Tiered Environmental Checklist form for each resource area. The checklist is used to assist in evaluating the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project with respect to the 2003 LRDP EIR. This section also presents a background summary for each resource area, the standards of significance, relevant impacts and mitigation measures from the 2003 LRDP EIR, and an explanation of all checklist answers.

Section 8 – Fish and Game Determination: indicates if the project has a potential to impact wildlife or habitat and if an associated Fish and Game filing fee would be paid.

Section 9 – References: lists references used in the preparation of this document.
Section 10 – Agencies and Persons Consulted: provides the names of individuals contacted in preparation of this document.

Section 11 – Report Preparers: lists the names of individuals involved in the preparation of this document.

Appendix A – Negative Declaration: presents the Negative Declaration for the project.

Appendix B – Responses to Comments: presents comments received on the Draft Tiered Initial Study and responses to these comments.
3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 REGIONAL LOCATION

The approximately 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 3.1). The campus is comprised of four campus units: the central campus, the south campus, the west campus, and Russell Ranch. Most academic and extracurricular activities occur within the central campus. The central campus is bounded generally by Russell Boulevard to the north, State Route 113 (SR 113) to the west, Interstate 80 (I-80) and the Union Pacific Railroad tracks to the south, and A Street 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 by SR 113 to the east, Putah Creek to the south, Russell Boulevard to the north, and extends approximately one-half mile west of County Road 98. The south and west campus units are contiguous with the central campus, and are used primarily for field teaching and research. The approximately 1,600 acre Russell Ranch portion of the campus lies to the west, separated from the west campus by approximately one and one-half miles of privately owned agricultural land. Russell Ranch was purchased in 1990 for campus uses including large-scale agricultural and environmental research, study of sustainable agricultural practices, and habitat mitigation. Russell Ranch is bordered roughly by County Road 96 on the east, Putah Creek on the south, Covell Boulevard on the north, and Russell Boulevard and privately owned agricultural land on the west and northwest.

3.2 PROJECT OVERVIEW

UC Davis is proposing to construct and operate the King Hall Renovation and Expansion project. The project would renovate and expand the existing Martin Luther King Jr. Law School building, located on Mrak Hall Drive, in the southern area of the central campus. Bordering uses include the Arboretum to the south; Mrak Hall and the circular drive to the east; Parking Lot 3 to the north; and an Operations and Maintenance (O&M) complex to the west. A portion of the O&M complex will be moved to a new location within the next year and will be replaced by a new Physical Sciences building (see Figure 3.2).

The School of Law at UC Davis moved into Martin Luther King, Jr. Hall, in 1968. To accommodate planned growth and the emergence of new programs as legal education evolved over the past 40 years, the School has incrementally partitioned and converted the space of the existing building to new functions. The result is a facility configuration that is inefficient, disjointed, over-crowded, and fundamentally insufficient to support the teaching, research, and service programs of the School.

To correct these deficiencies, the Davis campus proposes a project that integrates a 22 percent addition to King Hall with renovation of key portions of the existing building. The project would add approximately 18,800 assignable square feet (asf) (approximately 29,795 gross square feet), renovate approximately 14,300 asf (approximately 20,870 gross square feet), and upgrade building systems in the existing facility. The project would relieve over-crowding and allow consolidation of program functions in the existing building to address the most urgent needs for office space and library space. The project would include a new trial practice room and additional meeting space. The completed project would provide an integrated facility that coordinates office, library, and instructional functions into cohesive program units.

---

1 Gross square footage (gsf) is defined as the total floor or surface areas of a building. Assignable square footage (asf) is defined as the total floor or surface areas of rooms that are assigned or available for assignment to an occupant or specific use, including every type of space functionally usable by an occupant. For example, lobbies, restrooms or mechanical space do not have assignable space, and are not included in asf calculations. For similar buildings, asf is significantly lower than the corresponding “rentable square feet” used to describe commercial buildings.
Because the School is cramped for space and inefficiently organized, the project is intended only to provide relief and raise the ratio of total facility space to students to be comparable with peer institutions. Thus, while adding new space, the project would not add any new members of the campus population.

The project would require upgrade of offsite chilled water and steam utility lines. These upgrades likely would not be completed before the building renovation and addition were completed and occupied. Consequently, the project design would include options to provide cooling and heating to the building that do not require reliance upon these upgrades, but which would allow for connections to the campus chilled water and steam loops upon completion of those upgrades.

One of five Robert Arneson site-specific sculptures commissioned for the campus, colloquially referred to as the “eggheads,” is located on the law school project site (Figures 3.2 and 3.3). The Arneson sculptures were sited as part of the outdoor campus art collection in the early 1990s. The law school sculpture (titled See No Evil/Hear No Evil and comprised of two of the “eggheads”) would be relocated on the Mrak Hall Drive Circle next to the project site to retain the site-specific nature of the installation, per the intent of the artist (Figure 3.4).

Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to begin in winter or early spring 2008 and end in late fall 2009 or winter 2010.
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### 3.3 Project Site

The proposed project would renovate and expand the existing Martin Luther King Jr. Law School building, located on Mrak Hall Drive, in the southern area of the central campus (see Figure 3.2). The project site is approximately 2-½ acres. Bordering uses include the Arboretum to the south; Mrak Hall and the circular drive to the east; Parking Lot 3 to the north; and an Operations and Maintenance (O&M) complex to the west. A portion of the O&M complex will be moved to a new location within the next year and will be replaced by a new Physical Sciences building.

One of five Robert Arneson site-specific sculptures commissioned for the campus, colloquially referred to as the “eggheads,” is located on the law school site (see Figure 3.3). The Arneson sculptures were sited as part of the outdoor campus art collection in the early 1990s. The law school sculpture (titled *See No Evil/Hear No Evil* and comprised of two of the “eggheads”) would be relocated on the Mrak Hall Drive Circle next to the project site to retain the site-specific nature of the installation, per the intent of the artist (Figure 3.4).

The project would require upgrade of offsite chilled water and steam utility lines. These upgrades likely would not be completed before the building renovation and addition were completed and occupied. The new lines mainly would run to the west, along California Avenue, and north of the project site in existing utility corridors and existing roadways, completing the proposed Mrak Corridor loop. This approximate routing would be refined and the precise design and alignment for construction is still under consideration, in order to plan a route that minimizes disruption and maximally uses existing investment in piping.

The campus Arboretum, immediately south of King Hall, attracts a great number of visitors, both from the campus, and from the surrounding region. A path runs along the Arboretum, just downslope from King Hall. The proposed project would maintain access to and use of this path throughout construction, except during times when utility lines under the path are being upgraded or moved as part of the project.

Currently, a project to honor Native Americans with a site installation for contemplative and reflective activities is planned in the Arboretum to the south of the existing King Hall. This project would be sited between the Arboretum path and the Arboretum Waterway. See Figure 3.2 for the planned location of this project, which could be under construction simultaneously with the proposed law school project.

### 3.4 Project Need and Objectives

The School of Law at UC Davis moved into its current building, Martin Luther King, Jr. Hall, in 1968 with 337 students and 15 faculty members. The School has grown to 575 students and 39 full-time equivalent budgeted faculty members, with 5 legal journals, 4 clinical programs, a very active moot court, programs in trial and appellate advocacy, and 22 academic groups.

To accommodate growth and the emergence of new programs as legal education evolved over the past 40 years, the School has incrementally partitioned and converted the space of the existing building to new functions. The result of these incremental accommodations is a facility configuration that is inefficient, disjointed, over-crowded, and fundamentally insufficient to support the teaching, research, and service programs of the School. In its 2004 accreditation review, the American Bar Association concluded that the School’s facilities are “small and reflect an earlier era in legal education that make it difficult to function as a modern facility.”
To correct these deficiencies, the Davis campus proposes a capital improvement project that integrates a 22 percent addition to King Hall with renovation of key portions of the existing building. The project would add 18,800 asf, renovate 14,300 asf of existing space, and upgrade building systems in the existing facility. The project would relieve over-crowding and allow consolidation of program functions in the existing building to address the most urgent needs for office space and library space. The project would also include a new trial practice room and additional meeting space. The completed project would provide an integrated facility that coordinates office, library, and instructional functions into cohesive program units.

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

- Provide expanded and improved office and library spaces;
- Upgrade the existing building from its 40-year-old condition;
- Reorganize the library to improve circulation and security;
- Consolidate faculty offices into a single wing;
- Consolidate instructional space;
- Consolidate and expand student services;
- Provide space to expand academic and administrative functions not accommodated in the original 40-year-old design;
- Install fire alarm and fire sprinkler systems throughout the facility and provide domestic water connections to support the fire sprinkler system;
- Move all non-clinical functions from the temporary buildings to King Hall; and
- Implement sustainable design features.

As the campus grows, under the guidance of the 2003 LRDP, and as analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, utility upgrades will be required. The proposed project triggers the need for the campus to extend and improve chilled water and steam systems’ utility pipelines to serve the project and upgrade the campus utilities infrastructure in general.

### 3.5 Project Elements

#### 3.5.1 Buildings

The proposed project would renovate approximately 14,300 asf (20,870 gross square feet) of existing space in King Hall, including teaching space (1,000 asf), academic and administrative offices (4,400 asf), and library space (8,900 asf). The library would be extensively renovated to improve functional efficiency, circulation and access. Life safety systems (fire alarms and sprinklers) would be upgraded to meet current code. Renovations to teaching space mainly include installation of audio-visual technologies to better enable modern teaching methods. Academic and administrative offices would be remodeled to be on par with new academic and administrative office space constructed as part of the addition.

The project would also construct a building addition of approximately 18,800 asf (29,795 gross square feet) consisting of replacement teaching space (1,700 asf), new teaching space (2,500 asf), academic offices (5,300 asf), administrative offices (6,200 asf), research offices (900 asf), conference rooms (1,000 asf), and student support space (1,200 asf). Currently, the building is a classic C shape,
with a basement and two floors above-grade and a multi-level courtyard open to the east (see Figure 3.2). The addition would enclose this courtyard with two stories above-grade (see Figure 3.4), and would create a level walkway over the basement level of the courtyard to facilitate access to the library and other areas of the existing building. The south side of the addition will be stepped in a few feet from the existing building, and the pedestrian path along the southern edge of the project site would have a connection to the addition, in order to have an Arboretum-side entrance. The addition would be designed to respect and refer to the existing building's architectural style and materials (Figures 3.5 and 3.6) and would look out on the Arboretum along the south elevation, and across Mrak Hall Drive on the east elevation. A new main entrance to the building would be located along Mrak Hall Drive, providing a more prominent street address to the School of Law.

3.5.2 Landscaping

The existing courtyard garden would be renovated with new plantings and irrigation, as well as repair to the existing pavement and retaining walls. A mix of native and ornamental trees and shrubs would be planted for site landscaping, and a fully automated irrigation system would be installed. The landscaping palette would reflect the campus design standards to emphasize drought-tolerant plant selections to minimize irrigation requirements. To the extent feasible, existing trees would be protected in place, however approximately half of the site trees would be removed in order to construct the addition and accomplish the renovation. Site furnishings would include trash and recycling receptacles near pedestrian access to the building and outdoor lighting to the standards specified in the Campus Standards-Design Guidelines manual, including using the campus standard shielded, down-directed lighting fixture to minimize light escape at nighttime.

3.5.3 Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Vehicular Access and Parking

There is pedestrian and bicycle access to and from the proposed project site along Mrak Hall Drive, as well as on bike paths and sidewalks from the north and south (along the Arboretum). The path near the Arboretum, along the south side of the building, would be widened from approximately 10 feet to 20 feet from Mrak Hall Drive to the building in order to serve fire and life safety requirements. A pervious planted paving system is proposed for the section to be widened, in order to maintain a landscaped appearance along the edge of the building and minimize impervious paving.

Bicycle racks are located on the north side of the building and in front of the courtyard on the east side of the building. Racks that are displaced along the east side due to the building addition will be replaced as part of the project; those replacement racks will be located convenient to building entrances in the existing building and addition. New bicycle racks on the south side of the building are proposed as part of the project, at a new entrance on the Arboretum side of the addition.

Vehicular access to the proposed project site is via Mrak Hall Drive. Metered parking is located along this street, and permit parking is available in Parking Lot 3 immediately north of the project site, and in the South Entry Parking Structure south of the site. The project would not modify the roadways or parking facilities.

Together with relocation of the Arneson sculpture, pedestrian paths through the circle are part of the long-term plan for Mrak Hall Drive Circle (Figures 3.4 and 3.7). The paths would not be constructed simultaneously with the King Hall renovation and expansion activities, though the sculpture would be relocated during the project construction period. Construction of the paths would occur at a future date, after the King Hall construction is completed. As part of this long-term plan, the pedestrian path between the west side of Mrak Hall and Parking Lot 3, which leads to King Hall and the Mrak Hall Drive Circle, could also be reconfigured for greater ease and convenience of pedestrian circulation. Several metered parking spaces in front of Mrak Hall could be relocated to Parking Lot 3 as well.
3.5.4 Utilities and Infrastructure

As discussed briefly below and analyzed in Section 7.16, the proposed project would require connections to campus utilities and infrastructure.

- **Domestic Water**: Demand, as a result of the proposed renovation and addition, would be 120 gallons per minute (gpm); current demand is 110 gpm. Connection for the new addition would be made to the existing service line at the mechanical room in the existing building. Fire sprinklers would be installed throughout the existing facility, as well as the addition, as part of the project. A connection to the domestic water system would be made for the new fire sprinklers. An extension of the domestic water line would be required along the south edge of the project site to provide for required fire hydrants. The domestic water supply has adequate capacity to support the project.

- **Utility Water**: The existing line on the east side of King Hall would need to be relocated further east to accommodate the building addition. The project would impose minimal additional demand on the utility water system, which has adequate capacity to support the project.

- **Sanitary Sewer**: An existing 8” sanitary sewer line that crosses the southeast corner of the proposed addition would be relocated, and the project would repair the existing bike path and landscaping disturbed as a result. The project would make minimal, if any, additional demand on the system, which has adequate capacity to serve the project.

- **Storm Drainage**: Existing drain inlets at the northeast and southeast corners of the existing building would be relocated as a result of the proposed addition. The courtyard drainage system would require reconfiguration with the renovation. Rainwater planters and a bioswale are proposed to handle all new runoff generated by the building addition. The design intent of the bioswale would be to slow down and provide some pollutant filtration and soil percolation of runoff, before discharging remaining unpercolated runoff into the Arboretum Waterway. For this reason, the bioswale would likely be located on the east side of the project, leading to the Waterway. A storm drain connection to the Arboretum Waterway would be made for instances when the swale could not retain and infiltrate the amount of runoff typically associated with a 10-year storm event, the current campus standard for assessing storm drain capacity for a project.

- **Electricity**: The existing 750 KVA unit substation in the existing building basement is inadequate for the existing building. The proposed project would include upgrading the building substation and switchboard to a size adequate to handle the existing building and the new addition, including a new transformer (located outdoors, on the west side of the project site). A new fire alarm system would be installed in the building to replace the existing system, which does not meet present day standards. Aside from the improvements to the building required as part of the project, the campus electrical system would have adequate capacity to serve the project.

- **Telecommunications**: Additional service would be provided to the building via existing conduit; the campus telecommunications system has adequate capacity to serve the project and no upgrades would be required.
• Chilled Water and Steam: The project would require upgrade of offsite chilled water and steam utility lines. These upgrades likely would not be completed before the building renovation and addition were completed and occupied. Consequently, the project design includes options to provide cooling and heating to the building on a stand-alone basis during the interim period between project completion and the completion of the chilled water and steam pipeline upgrades. Each of the possible options would allow for connections to the campus chilled water and steam loops upon completion of those upgrades. The campus could connect King Hall to these central campus utilities as soon as the upgrades are completed; however, several of the proposed options also could provide long-term heating and cooling for the building. Interim heating and cooling systems solutions could include:

1. Installing both an electric heating coil and a hot water heating coil in the new air handling unit for the new addition. The system could provide heat using electricity until the campus steam system is upgraded. At that time, the hot water coil would be connected to the hot water system and the electric coil would be inactive.

2. Installing gas fired hot water boilers in the mechanical room and providing a hot water heating coil in the new air handler unit for the new addition. Once the campus steam system is upgraded, steam would be used to generate hot water and the boilers would be inactive. This option would require extending natural gas services to this facility along the west and north of the project site in the existing utility corridors and existing roadways.

3. Installing a rooftop system for the new addition, containing both an air cooled refrigeration cycle and water cooling coil. Initially operate the system using the air cooled cycle for cooling. Once the campus chilled water system is upgraded, the chilled water coil would be activated and the air cooled system would be inactive.

4. Providing a trailer mounted air cooled chilled water system or evaporative chiller next to the existing building to provide cooling for both the existing building and the new addition. This option could take up several parking spaces in Lot 3, north of the building.

5. Using a geothermal water source heat pump system in the new addition which would take advantage of the earth as a heat sink to supply both heating and cooling. The heat pumps could either be unitary type or larger central systems and could also generate hot and chilled water for the existing building. This would be a permanent installation and allow the building to operate without the use of campus chilled water or steam. This option would require the use of natural gas or electricity to supplement the heating component. The campus electrical system has sufficient capacity to support the use of electricity. The campus would need to extend a connection from the building to the natural gas system, if natural gas were to be used to provide supplemental heating.

### 3.5.5 Sustainable Design Elements

The proposed project would comply with the Regental Policy on Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards, and would meet the campus baseline as applicable to the project.

---

2 UC Davis has established a campus baseline, which is the minimum number of applicable Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) rating system “points” that each project on the campus will achieve. With the passage of the Regental Policy on Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards, each campus in the UC System was required to devise a campus baseline. While the UC System does not require each system campus to apply for United States Green Building Council LEED certification, the UC has committed to achieving a level of building performance comparable to that of LEED certification. The campus baseline provides the starting level of building performance objectives for all campus projects, with the exception of medical facilities.
Designs for the new addition would be attentive to sun shading appropriate to each side of the new building, in order to maximize interior daylight as well as minimize undesirable solar heat gain during the warm months of the year. Daylit classrooms and offices have been shown to increase productivity and learning outcomes, in addition to reducing energy consumption needed for interior artificial lighting (Heschong Mahone 2003).

A bioswale is proposed to handle all new runoff that would be generated by the building addition as a result of the project. Bioswales use vegetation (often native plants), gradient, and cobbles to slow down runoff flow to allow time for some filtration and percolation of the water before discharging any unpercolated water to the storm drain system, which on the UC Davis campus flows to the Arboretum Waterway.

In addition, stormwater planters are proposed for the project. Stormwater planters are essentially planted cisterns which hold the water and allow for filtration and absorption by plants adapted to moist and seasonally dry conditions.

### 3.5.6 Population

The proposed project, while adding square footage to the total built space of the campus, would not add any new members of the campus population. Because the School is cramped for space and inefficiently organized, the project is intended only to provide relief and raise the ratio of total facility space to students to be comparable with peer institutions. Even with the additional square footage, the School would still rank below most of its peers in space per student (from 45th out of 46 small law schools to 33rd out of 46). The School is subject to enrollment control, and is to remain small.

### 3.6 Construction Schedule and Staging

Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to begin in winter or early spring 2008 and end in late fall 2009 or winter 2010. Construction staging areas associated with the proposed project are expected to be on the north and east edges of the site, along Parking Lot 3 and Mrak Hall Drive, west of Parking Lot 3, and adjacent to the South Entry Parking Structure, depending upon project phase and site requirements. Contractor parking would be purchased in Parking Lot 1, south of the South Entry Parking Structure.

The construction timeline of the chilled water and steam utility line upgrades has not been determined, but is anticipated to occur within the next four years. The duration of construction for the utility lines is expected to be between 4 and 6 months.
4  CONSISTENCY WITH THE 2003 LRDP AND 2003 LRDP EIR

In order to determine the proposed project’s consistency with the 2003 LRDP and 2003 LRDP EIR, the following questions must be answered:

- Is the proposed project included in the scope of the development projected in the 2003 LRDP?
- Is the proposed location of the project in an area designated for this type of use in the 2003 LRDP?
- Are the changes to campus population associated with the proposed project included within the scope of the 2003 LRDP’s population projections?
- Are the objectives of the proposed project consistent with the objectives adopted for the 2003 LRDP?
- Is the proposed project within the scope of the cumulative analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR?

The following discussion describes the proposed project’s relationship to and consistency with the development projections, population projections, land use designations, objectives, and cumulative impacts analyses contained in the 2003 LRDP.

4.1  2003 LRDP SCOPE OF DEVELOPMENT

The proposed project would relieve overcrowding in the School of Law, improve the facilities to contemporary standards, and bring the School closer to peer institutions in terms of space per student, and quality of space.

The 2003 LRDP anticipates academic and administrative space on campus will increase to approximately 7,175,000 asf through 2015-16. In fall 2002, the campus had only approximately 4,475,000 asf of academic and administrative space. The proposed project would construct an 18,800 asf building addition of academic/administrative space, which, in combination with other recently approved and currently proposed projects, would not increase academic and administrative building space on campus to levels that would exceed those projected for 2015-16. Therefore, the proposed project is well within the 2003 LRDP’s scope of academic and administrative development.

4.2  2003 LRDP LAND USE DESIGNATION

The proposed project site is designated for Academic and Administrative land uses in the 2003 LRDP. The project would renovate existing academic space and add academic and administrative space, consistent with the land use designation for the site.

4.3  2003 LRDP POPULATION PROJECTIONS

The 2003 LRDP projects that, through 2015-16, the on-campus population will increase to include approximately 30,000 students, 14,500 faculty and staff, and 3,240 non-UC employees. In addition,
the total number of household members associated with students and employees living in on-campus housing is expected to increase to approximately 29,803. The fall 2003 on-campus faculty and staff headcount was approximately 10,500, and the 2002-03 three-quarter average on-campus student population was approximately 26,650 (UC Davis ORMP 2003a and b).

The proposed project, while adding square footage to the total built space of the campus, would not add any new members of the campus population. Therefore, the proposed project is well within the 2003 LRDP’s on-campus population projections.

4.4 2003 LRDP OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of the 2003 LRDP is to plan for the Davis campus’ share of the University of California’s short- and long- term enrollment demands. In addition, the 2003 LRDP aims to:

- create a physical framework to support the teaching, research, and public service mission of the campus;
- manage campus lands and resources in a spirit of stewardship for the future; and
- provide an environment that enriches campus life and serves the greater community.

The proposed project would advance these main 2003 LRDP objectives by providing needed academic and administrative space to support the School of Law and bring the School’s facilities closer to the standards of peer institutions and the American Bar Association, the accrediting body for law schools.

Improving the chilled water and steam utility lines advances the main objectives by assuring that appropriate services are provided to campus users to support their mission-related efforts and to achieve efficiencies in utility provision and energy usage.

In addition, the 2003 LRDP includes specific objectives that are relevant to the proposed project, including the following:

Academic Districts and Neighborhood Centers: Support the creation of distinct academic neighborhoods and the aesthetic cohesiveness within such neighborhoods. Provide gathering spaces in academic neighborhoods to serve as centers of activity and places of identity. [2003 LRDP, p. 41].

Academic Facilities Growth: Provide flexibility to locate 2.5 million additional square feet in Academic and Administrative land use, largely through infill development in the Academic Core and Health Sciences District. [2003 LRDP, p. 59].

Arboretum Connections to Academic Core: Find opportunities to better connect the environment of pathways, open spaces, and buildings in the Central Campus to the Arboretum. Extend the landscape character of the Arboretum into the fabric of the Central Campus where appropriate. [2003 LRDP, p. 41].

Bikeways: Sustain and expand the system of off-street bike paths, on-street bike lanes, and bicycle parking areas throughout the campus. … [2003 LRDP, p. 41].

The proposed project would advance the 2003 LRDP objectives relating to academic space by renovating approximately 14,300 asf of existing space and adding 18,800 asf of space to support the objectives of the School of Law and to bring the School closer to peer institutions in such standard measures as amount of space per student.
The proposed project would advance the 2003 LRDP objective relating to strengthening connections between the academic core and the Arboretum by creating a new side entrance from the law school building out to the Arboretum pathway south of the building.

The proposed project would advance the 2003 LRDP objective relating to facilitating bicycle transportation by improving existing bicycle parking and adding bicycle parking. The appropriate location and number of additional bike spaces would be designed, taking into account project objectives and campus standards on number of spaces according to occupancy rates.

4.5 2003 LRDP EIR CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ANALYSES

In addition to evaluating the environmental effects directly associated with projected campus development, the 2003 LRDP EIR evaluates the cumulative effects of campus development combined with off-campus development through 2015-16. The cumulative context considered in the 2003 LRDP EIR varies, depending on the nature of the issue being studied, to best assess each issue’s geographic extent. For example, the cumulative impacts on water and air quality can be best analyzed within the boundaries of the affected resources, such as water bodies and air basins. For other cumulative impacts, such as hazard risks, traffic, and the need for new public service facilities, the cumulative impact is best analyzed within the context of the population growth and associated development that are expected to occur in the region.

As discussed in Sections 4.1 through 4.4 above, the proposed project is within the scope of campus development projected in the 2003 LRDP EIR. In addition, the campus is unaware of any changes to local growth plans or other changes in the region since certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR that would substantially change the document’s conclusions regarding cumulative impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would incrementally contribute to, but would not exceed, the cumulative impacts analyses included in the 2003 LRDP EIR.

The environmental resource discussions that follow in this document conclude that the project would result in the following types of cumulative impacts.

- The proposed project would not contribute to significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR related to: loss of scenic vistas (Section 7.1); conversion of prime farmland (Section 7.2); loss of habitat for Swainson’s hawks and burrowing owls (Section 7.4); loss of wetland and riparian habitat (Section 7.4); loss of valley elderberry beetle habitat (Section 7.4); increased ambient noise levels (Section 7.11); construction of police and fire service facilities (Section 7.13); construction of school facilities (Section 7.13); development of recreation facilities (Section 7.14); degraded intersection and freeway operations (Section 7.15); construction of wastewater treatment facilities (Section 7.16).

- The proposed project would incrementally contribute to, but would not exceed, significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR related to: degradation of visual character or quality (Section 7.1); increases in light and glare (Section 7.1); increases in criteria pollutant emissions (Section 7.3); loss of archaeological and historical resources (Section 7.5); degraded receiving water quality (Section 7.8); increased water extraction from the deep aquifers (Section 7.8); and increased water extraction from the shallow/intermediate aquifers (Section 7.8).

- The proposed project would incrementally contribute to, but would not exceed, less-than-significant cumulative impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR related to: exposure to carbon monoxide concentrations (Section 7.3); increased toxic air contaminants (Section 7.3); exposure to seismic ground shaking (Section 7.6); use and transport of hazardous materials
and generation of hazardous wastes (Section 7.7); exceedance of storm water drainage systems (Section 7.8); and discharge of treated effluent to Putah Creek (Section 7.8).
5 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors, if checked below, would be potentially affected by this project and would involve at least one impact that is a significant or potentially significant impact that has not been previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology, Soils & Seismicity
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology & Water Quality
- Land Use & Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population & Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation, Circulation & Parking
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

As indicated in the checklist above and based on the analysis presented in this Tiered Initial Study, it has been determined that for all resource areas, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level or are not sufficiently addressed by the 2003 LRDP EIR. This Tiered Initial Study has concluded that the project would incrementally contribute to, but would not exceed, certain significant impacts previously identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR, and that for such impacts, no new mitigation measures, other than those previously identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR, are required. The project would not require project-specific mitigation measures. Therefore, preparation of a Negative Declaration is appropriate. The Negative Declaration is presented in Appendix A.
6 DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☑️ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment that has not been previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, and no new mitigation measures, other than those previously identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR, are required. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION has been prepared. The Negative Declaration is presented in Appendix A.

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD have a significant effect on the environment that has not been previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, and __ new project-specific mitigation measure[s], in addition to those previously identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR, [is/are] required to reduce this effect to such a point that clearly no significant impact would occur. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a potentially significant effect on the environment that was not previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR. A TIERED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT will be prepared to address new impacts not previously identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR.

__________________________________________  _______________
John A. Meyer        Date
Vice Chancellor – Resource Management and Planning
7 EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Introduction

The following Environmental Checklist form is based on the checklist suggested in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, and it has been adapted to assist in evaluating the environmental effects of the proposed project with respect to the analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR.

The Environmental Checklist identifies potential project effects as corresponding to the following categories of impacts:

- **Potentially Significant Impact**: An effect that it was not previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and may be significant based on substantial evidence and the significance criteria. If the project may result in one or more Potentially Significant Impacts, an EIR is required. This Tiered Initial Study does not identify any potentially significant impacts that were not addressed in the 2003 LRDP, and therefore, no EIR is required.

- **Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**: An effect that was not adequately addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, but with the implementation of project-specific mitigation measures, is reduced from potentially significant to less than significant. This Tiered Initial Study does not identify any potentially significant impacts that were not previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR; therefore, no project-specific mitigation measures are required.

- **Impact for Which the 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient**: An effect that was adequately addressed and mitigated to the extent feasible in the 2003 LRDP EIR (the Program EIR). For these effects, the Tiered Initial Study explains how the effect was addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and why the criteria for supplemental environmental review under CEQA Section 21166 (project changes, changed circumstances, and/or new information) have not been triggered. Effects correspond to this category under the following circumstances:
  a) The 2003 LRDP EIR found the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the implementation of applicable 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures;
  b) The impact is significant and unavoidable at a cumulative level, and the 2003 LRDP EIR fully addressed the cumulative impact; or
  c) The impact is significant and unavoidable at a project level, but the LRDP EIR contained an adequate project-level analysis for the impact.

- **Less than Significant Impact**: An effect for which no significant impacts, only less than significant impacts, would occur.

- **No Impact**: The project does not create an impact.
7.1 AESTHETICS

7.1.1 Background

Section 4.1 of the 2003 LRDP EIR addresses the aesthetics effects of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP. The following discussion summarizes information presented in the ‘Setting’ subsection of Section 4.1 of the 2003 LRDP EIR.

Campus

The campus is surrounded by extensive agricultural uses to the west and south, and by residential, institutional, and commercial land uses in the City of Davis to the north and east. Views within the Davis area are generally of two types: open views of agricultural land and supporting facilities with views of hills to the west, and views of developed areas within UC Davis and the City of Davis.

UC Davis consists of four general land units that have distinct visual characters. The central campus is the most developed area of campus and is characterized by varied architectural styles, large trees, and formal landscaping. The west and south campus units and Russell Ranch primarily include teaching and research fields with agricultural buildings (although the west and south campus units also include more developed areas including campus support facilities and academic and administrative facilities).

The 2003 LRDP identifies the following as valued visual elements of the central campus: the large, open lawn of the Quad at the heart of the campus; the framework of tree-lined streets, particularly around the Quad where the street tree branches arch to create a canopy overhead; the Arboretum, with its large trees and variety of landscapes along the waterway; the shingle-sided buildings from the founding years of the University Farm; buildings from the second era of campus development such as Hart Hall and Walker Hall; green open spaces that face the community along Russell Boulevard and A Street; bicycles as a distinct and valued visual emblem on campus; and the South Entry area, including the new entrance quad and the Robert and Margrit Mondavi Center for the Performing Arts.

Design review of campus development projects takes place during the project planning, design, review, and approval processes to sustain valued elements of the campus’ visual environment, to assure new projects contribute to a connected and cohesive campus environment, and to otherwise minimize adverse aesthetics effects as feasible. Formal design review by the campus Design Review Committee takes place for every major capital project. This Committee includes standing members from the Offices of Resource Management and Planning, Architects and Engineers, Grounds, and other departments concerned with potential aesthetic effects, as well as program representatives and invited design professionals with expertise relevant to the project type. Campus design standards and plans that provide the basis for design review include the 2003 LRDP, the Campus Standards and Design Guide manual, the campus Architectural Design Guidelines, and the Campus Core Study.

Project Site

The project site can be seen from Mrak Hall Drive, the Arboretum, and Parking Lot 3. The project site is characterized visually by the Arneson sculptures on the east side of the site (see Figure 3.2 in Section 3.2), the proximity to the Arboretum, a variety of trees, and the existing brick and concrete building. Views from the site include: to the north, Parking Lot 3 and trees along a bike path at the northern edge of Lot 3; to the northeast and east, Mrak Hall, Mrak Hall Drive Circle, and a portion of the Arboretum; to the south, the Arboretum and adjacent paths; and to the west, utility roads and facilities operation and maintenance buildings and vehicles. There are no views of the Coast Range from the site.
7.1.2 2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance

The 2003 LRDP EIR considers an aesthetic impact significant if growth under the 2003 LRDP would:

- Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
  A scenic vista is defined as a publicly accessible viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly valued landscape. On campus, the open view across agricultural lands west to the Coast Range is considered a scenic vista. This vista is primarily viewed from public viewpoints along SR 113, Hutchison Drive, La Rue Road, and Russell Boulevard.

- Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
  For the campus, this standard is interpreted in terms of the effect of development under the 2003 LRDP on the valued elements of the visual landscape identified in the LRDP, or the effect associated with allowing incompatible development in or near areas with high visual quality such as Putah Creek and the Arboretum Waterway.

- Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.
  An additional standard from the CEQA Guidelines’ Environmental Checklist (“b” in the checklist below) was found not applicable to campus growth under the 2003 LRDP.

7.1.3 2003 LRDP EIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on aesthetics are evaluated in Section 4.1 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. As analyzed in Section 4 of this Initial Study, the proposed project is within the scope of analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR. Significant and potentially significant aesthetics impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are relevant to the proposed project are presented below with their corresponding levels of significance before and after application of mitigation measures identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR. Mitigation measures are relevant to reduce the magnitude of cumulative impacts 4.1-5 and 4.1-6, but these impacts are identified as significant and unavoidable because the feasibility and/or implementation of mitigation falls within other jurisdictions and therefore cannot be guaranteed by the University of California.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2003 LRDP EIR Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AESTHETICS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1-2 Development on campus from implementation of the 2003 LRDP could degrade the visual character of the campus by substantially degrading the valued elements of the visual landscape identified in the 2003 LRDP.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1-3 Development under the 2003 LRDP could create substantial light or glare on campus that could adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1-5 Development allowed under the 2003 LRDP, in conjunction with other development in the region could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the region.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1-6 Implementation of the 2003 LRDP together with cumulative development in the region would create new sources of light and glare that could adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the region.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of Significance: LS=Less than Significant, S=Significant, PS=Potentially Significant, SU=Significant and Unavoidable
Mitigation measures in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are applicable to the proposed project are presented below. Since these mitigation measures are already being carried out as part of implementation of the 2003 LRDP, they will not be readopted in this Initial Study or Negative Declaration. The benefits of these mitigation measures will be achieved independently of considering them as specific mitigation measures of this project. Nothing in this Initial Study in any way alters the obligations of the campus to implement 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures.

### 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

#### AESTHETICS

| 4.1-2(a) | New structures, roads, and landscaping at UC Davis shall be designed to be compatible with the visual elements and policies identified in the 2003 LRDP. |
| 4.1-2(b) | Prior to design approval of development projects under the 2003 LRDP, the campus Design Review Committee must determine that project designs are consistent with the valued elements of the visual landscape identified in the 2003 LRDP, applicable planning guidelines, and the character of surrounding development so that the visual character and quality of the project area are not substantially degraded. |
| 4.1-3(a) | Design for specific projects shall provide for the use of textured nonreflective exterior surfaces and nonreflective glass. |
| 4.1-3(b) | Except as provided in LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(c), all new outdoor lighting shall utilize directional lighting methods with shielded and cutoff type light fixtures to minimize glare and upward directed lighting. |
| 4.1-3(c) | Non-cutoff, non-shielded lighting fixtures used to enhance nighttime views of walking paths, specific landscape features, or specific architectural features shall be reviewed by the Campus Design Review Committee prior to installation to ensure that: (1) the minimum amount of required lighting is proposed to achieve the desired nighttime emphasis, and (2) the proposed illumination creates no adverse effect on nighttime views. |
| 4.1-3(d) | The campus will implement the use of the specified lighting design and equipment when older lighting fixtures and designs are replaced over time. |
| 4.1-5(a) | Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.1-2(a) and (b). |
| 4.1-5(b) | The cities of Davis, Woodland, Winters, and Dixon, and Yolo and Solano counties can and should implement policies in their plans that address the protection of scenic resources and maintenance of visual quality. |
| 4.1-6(a) | Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(a) and (b). |
| 4.1-6(b) | The City of Davis and other surrounding jurisdictions can and should adopt (if necessary) and implement development standards and guidelines, which support the minimal use of site lighting for new developments. |

### 7.1.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

#### AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project…</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact for which 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<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>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) The 2003 LRDP EIR defined a scenic vista as an expansive view of a highly valued landscape from a publicly accessible viewpoint, and identified the only scenic vista on the UC Davis campus to be the view west across agricultural land to the Coast Range. On and near campus, viewpoints along SR 113, Hutchison Drive, La Rue Road, and Russell Boulevard provide scenic vistas to the west across agricultural land to the Coast Range. The project site is neither visible from a scenic vista, nor has a view of a scenic vista. No impact would occur.

b,c) The campus is not located near a state scenic highway. However, the 2003 LRDP EIR found that development on campus under the 2003 LRDP could degrade the visual character of the campus by substantially degrading the valued elements of the campus’ visual landscape, which are identified above in the background discussion and include specific treed areas, historic buildings, and open space areas (Impact 4.1-2). The project site is adjacent to the Arboretum, identified in the 2003 LRDP as a valued element of the campus’ visual landscape. The proposed addition would be stepped back from the existing building and would respect and refer to the existing building’s architectural style and materials (see Figures 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6). To the extent possible, the colors of the concrete and brick of the existing building would be matched with, or would complement, the exterior surfaces of addition to create a harmonious façade. New project landscaping would be similar to existing landscaping, with lawn and trees predominating. A small, new bicycle parking area is proposed on the south side of the building, approximately where the new addition would be joined to the existing building. The existing bicycle path would remain in place. The Arneson sculpture would be relocated in the Mrak Circle (see Figure 3.7), in a similar configuration using spaced-apart mounds to preserve the intent of the piece.

In compliance with LRDP Mitigation 4.1-2(a), the proposed project would be designed to be compatible with the visual elements and policies identified in the 2003 LRDP. In compliance with LRDP Mitigation 4.1-2(b), the campus Design Review Committee would review the project design for consistency with the valued elements of the campus’ visual landscape, applicable planning guidelines, and the character of surrounding development. With implementation of these measures, which are relevant to the project, the project’s potential impact on scenic resources and visual character would be less than significant.

The 2003 LRDP EIR found that development under the 2003 LRDP together with other development in the region could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the region (Impact 4.1-5). LRDP Mitigation 4.1-5(a), included in the proposed project, requires the campus to implement Mitigation Measure 4.1-2(a-b), discussed above. LRDP Mitigation 4.1-5(b) indicates that local jurisdictions can and should implement policies that protect scenic resources and visual quality. However, the feasibility and/or implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.1-5(b) cannot be guaranteed by the University of California because enforcement and monitoring fall within other jurisdictions. For this reason, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable. This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information has become available since certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR that would alter this previous analysis.

d) The 2003 LRDP EIR found that development on campus under the 2003 LRDP could create substantial light or glare that could adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area (Impact 4.1-3). The proposed design calls for glass to be used in the building entry on the east face. The design proposes screening in front of the glass to guard against glare and overheating. The proposed lighting design concept calls for nighttime lighting of the entrance. In compliance with LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(a), the project would use textured nonreflective exterior surfaces and nonreflective glass. In compliance with LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(b-c), new outdoor lighting
associated with the project would use directional lighting methods with shielded and cutoff type light fixtures to minimize glare and upward directed lighting, except in specific, limited locations to enhance nighttime views of walking paths, specific landscape features, or specific architectural features. In compliance with this measure, the Campus Design Review Committee will also review the proposed project's use of non-directional lighting design to ensure that no adverse effects on nighttime views occur. In compliance with LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(d), the campus will replace older lighting fixtures over time with directional lighting. With implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(a-d), which is included in the proposed project, the project's impact associated with light and glare would be less than significant.

The 2003 LRDP EIR found that campus development under the 2003 LRDP in conjunction with other development in the region would add new sources of light and glare that could adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area (Impact 4.1-6). LRDP Mitigation 4.1-6(a), included in the proposed project, requires the campus to implement Mitigation Measure 4.1-3(a) and (b), discussed above. LRDP Mitigation 4.1-6(b) indicates that local jurisdictions can and should adopt and implement development standards and guidelines that support reduced lighting. However, the feasibility and/or implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.1-6(b) cannot be guaranteed by the University of California because enforcement and monitoring fall within other jurisdictions. For this reason, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable. This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information has become available since certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR that would alter this previous analysis.

**Summary**

Mitigation measures 4.1-2(a-b), 4.1-3(a-d), 4.1-5(a-b), and 4.1-6(a-b) from the 2003 LRDP EIR are relevant to the proposed project and reduce the significance of aesthetics impacts to the extent feasible. The proposed project would not exceed the levels of significance of aesthetics impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant aesthetics impacts that were not previously addressed.
7.2 **Agricultural Resources**

7.2.1 **Background**

Section 4.2 of the 2003 LRDP EIR addresses the agricultural resources effects of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP. The following discussion summarizes information presented in the ‘Setting’ subsection of Section 4.2 of the 2003 LRDP EIR.

**Campus**

As discussed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, of the approximately 5,300 acres of campus land, the California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) designates approximately 3,700 acres as Prime Farmland and approximately 90 acres as Farmland of Local Importance. The FMMP designates the remaining 1,520 acres of campus land as Urban and Built-Up (approximately 1,400 acres) and Other Land (approximately 120 acres). Most of the campus’ agricultural lands are located on the west and south campuses and at Russell Ranch. The central campus includes land primarily designated as Urban and Built-Up, but small areas within the central campus that are used for teaching and research fields and community gardens are designated as Prime Farmland.

The 2003 LRDP EIR identifies that development under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 could result in conversion of approximately 745 acres of campus land that is considered prime farmland by the California Department of Conservation to nonagricultural uses. Approximately 330 acres of this land would be converted to habitat at Russell Ranch, which would not result in an irreversible loss of prime soil. Mitigation under the 2003 LRDP EIR requires the conservation of prime farmland at a one-to-one (1:1) ratio for prime farmland converted to developed uses and a one-third–to–one (1/3:1) ratio for prime farmland converted to habitat at Russell Ranch.

**Project Site**

There are no agricultural resources on or adjacent to the project site. The project site is identified as urban/built-up land in the FMMP. The project site is bounded on the south by a cultivated landscape for aesthetic, recreational, and educational uses. There are roads and parking lots to the north, east, and west of the site.

7.2.2 **2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance**

The 2003 LRDP EIR considers an agricultural impact significant if growth under the 2003 LRDP would:

- Convert prime farmland, unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to nonagricultural use.
- Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland considered prime, unique, or of statewide importance to nonagricultural use.
- Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

7.2.3 **2003 LRDP EIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures**
Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on agricultural resources are evaluated in Section 4.2 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. As analyzed in Section 4 of this Initial Study, the proposed project is within the scope of analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR. There are no significant agricultural impacts that were identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are relevant to the proposed project, and no agricultural resources mitigation measures identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR are required for the project.

### 7.2.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGROcultural RESOURCES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact for which 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

a) The project site is designated as “Urban and Built-up Land” under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. No Farmland would be converted. Thus, the proposed project would not contribute to either a project-level or a cumulative impact associated with conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use. No impact would occur.

b) Campus lands are state lands and are not eligible for Williamson Act agreements, nor are they subject to local zoning controls. The proposed project site is designated as “Urban and Built-up Land” by the State of California Department of Conservation, and is designated for an Academic and Administrative land use in the 2003 LRDP. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with an existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract, and no impact would occur.

c) The proposed project would not involve any activity that could conflict with an existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract, and no impact would occur.

**Summary**

No agricultural resource LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures from the 2003 LRDP EIR are relevant to the proposed project. The proposed project would not exceed the levels of significance of agricultural impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant agricultural impacts that were not previously addressed.
7.3 Air Quality

7.3.1 Background

Section 4.3 of the 2003 LRDP EIR addresses the air quality effects of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP on air quality. The following discussion summarizes information presented in the ‘Setting’ subsection of Section 4.3 of the 2003 LRDP EIR.

Campus

The campus is subject to air quality regulation programs under both the federal Clean Air Act (CAA) and the California Clean Air Act (CCAA). Both the federal and state statutes provide for ambient air quality standards to protect public health, timetables for progressing toward achieving and maintaining ambient standards, and the development of plans to guide the air quality improvement efforts of state and local agencies. Within the campus vicinity, air quality is monitored, evaluated, and controlled by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Air Resources Board (CARB), and the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD). The YSAQMD is one of five air districts located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) and has jurisdiction over air quality in the Yolo County and the northeastern portion of Solano County.

Historically, air quality laws and regulations have divided air pollutants into two broad categories: “criteria pollutants” and “toxic air contaminants.” Federal and state air quality standards have been established for the following ambient air pollutants, which are called criteria pollutants: ozone (O₃), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀), lead (Pb), and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM₂.₅). Ozone is evaluated by assessing emissions of its precursors: reactive organic gases (ROG) and NO₂.

Toxic air contaminants (TACs) are airborne pollutants for which there are no air quality standards but are known to have adverse human health effects. TACs are regulated under federal and state statutes, primarily with control technology requirements for stationary and mobile sources and mitigation established following human health risk assessments. Air toxics are generated by a number of sources, including stationary sources, such as dry cleaners, gas stations, combustion sources, and laboratories; mobile sources, such as automobiles; and area sources, such as farms, landfills, construction sites, and residential areas.

Air quality on campus on any given day is influenced by both meteorological conditions and pollutant emissions. In general, meteorological conditions vary more than pollutant emissions from day to day, and, therefore, tend to have a greater influence on changes in measured ambient pollutant concentrations. Ambient concentrations of CO and PM₁₀ are particularly influenced by local emission sources. The EPA has classified the entire SVAB, which includes the campus, as a severe nonattainment area for O₃. The CARB has also designated the area as being in nonattainment under the state ambient air quality standards for O₃ and PM₁₀. The designation of an area as attainment and nonattainment is based on monitored data throughout the SVAB.

Project Site

The proposed project site is located west of the Operations & Maintenance complex, south of Parking Lot 3, east of Mrak Hall Drive, and north of the campus Arboretum. In terms of sensitive receptors on or adjacent to the project site, the School of Law has a small parent co-operative nursery for the infants of law school students; up to six infants are accommodated in the nursery while their parents
attend classes (King Hall 2006). Existing air pollutant sources on or near the site include the operation of motorized vehicles and landscape maintenance equipment.

### 7.3.2 2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance

The 2003 LRDP EIR considers an air quality impact significant if growth under the 2003 LRDP would:

**Criteria Pollutants**

- Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.
- Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. (According to the YSAQMD, emissions of NOx and ROG in excess of 82 pounds a day, CO emissions in excess of 550 pounds a day, and 150 pounds a day for PM10 would be considered significant.)
- 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).
- Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

**Toxic Air Contaminants**

- Contribute to the probability of contracting cancer for the Maximally Exposed Individual (MEI) exceeding the AB 2588 and Proposition 65 threshold of 10 in one million.
- Result in a noncancerogenic (chronic and acute) health hazard index greater than the AB 2588 threshold of 1.0.

### 7.3.3 2003 LRDP EIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on air quality are evaluated in Section 4.3 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. As analyzed in Section 4 of this Initial Study, the proposed project is within the scope of analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR. Significant and potentially significant air quality impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are relevant to the proposed project are presented below with their corresponding levels of significance before and after application of mitigation measures identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR. Mitigation is relevant to reduce the magnitude of project-level impact 4.3-1 and cumulative impact 4.3-6, but these impacts are identified as significant and unavoidable because they cannot be fully mitigated. Mitigation is identified to reduce the magnitude of project-level impact 4.3-3, but this impact is identified as significant and unavoidable due to uncertainty about the effectiveness of the mitigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2003 LRDP EIR Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIR QUALITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3-1</td>
<td>Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would result in daily operational emissions above the YSAQMD thresholds that may contribute substantially to a violation of air quality standards or hinder attainment of the regional air quality plan.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mitigation measures in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are applicable to the proposed project are presented below. Since these mitigation measures are already being carried out as part of implementation of the 2003 LRDP, they will not be readopted in this Initial Study or Negative Declaration. The benefits of these mitigation measures will be achieved independently of considering them as specific mitigation measures of this project. Nothing in this Initial Study in any way alters the obligations of the campus to implement 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2003 LRDP EIR Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3-3 Emissions from construction activities associated with the 2003 LRDP would exceed YSAQMD thresholds.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3-6 Implementation of the 2003 LRDP, in conjunction with other regional development, would result in a cumulatively considerable increase of non-attainment pollutants.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3-8 Regional growth could result in an increase in toxic air contaminants if compensating technological improvements are not implemented.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of Significance: LS=Less than Significant, S=Significant, PS=Potentially Significant, SU=Significant and Unavoidable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>AIR QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3-1(a) Vehicular Sources. The following measures will be implemented to reduce emissions from vehicles, as feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The campus shall continue to actively pursue Transportation Demand Management to reduce reliance on private automobiles for travel to and from the campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide pedestrian-enhancing infrastructure to encourage pedestrian activity and discourage vehicle use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide bicycle facilities to encourage bicycle use instead of driving.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide transit-enhancing infrastructure to promote the use of public transportation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide facilities to accommodate alternative-fuel vehicles such as electric cars and CNG vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve traffic flows and congestion by timing of traffic signals to facilitate uninterrupted travel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• When the campus purchases new vehicles, the campus will evaluate the practicality and feasibility of acquiring low-pollution vehicles that are appropriate for the task and will purchase these types of vehicles when practical and feasible. When replacing diesel engines in existing equipment, the campus will install up-to-date technology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3-1(b) Area Sources. The following measures will be implemented to reduce emissions from area sources, as feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use solar or low-emission water heaters in new or renovated buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Orient buildings to take advantage of solar heating and natural cooling and use passive solar designs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase wall and attic insulation in new or renovated buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For fireplaces or wood-burning appliances, require low-emitting EPA certified wood-burning appliances, or residential natural-gas fireplaces.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide electric equipment for landscape maintenance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3-1(c) The campus will work with the YSAQMD to ensure that emissions directly and indirectly associated with the campus are adequately accounted for and mitigated in applicable air quality planning efforts. The YSAQMD can and should adopt adequate measures consistent with applicable law to ensure that air quality standard violations are avoided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

#### AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.3-3(a) | The campus shall include in all construction contracts the measures specified below to reduce fugitive dust impacts, including but not limited to the following:  
  - All disturbed areas, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purpose, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, or vegetative ground cover.  
  - All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.  
  - All land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled of fugitive dust emissions utilizing application of water or by presoaking.  
  - When demolishing buildings up to six stories in height, all exterior surfaces of the building shall be wetted during demolition.  
  - When materials are transported off-site, all material shall be covered, effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, or at least two feet of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained.  
  - All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at least once every 24 hours when operations are occurring. The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions. Use of blower devices also is expressly forbidden.  
  - Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of outdoor storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emissions by utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant. |
| 4.3-3(b) | The campus shall include in construction contracts for large construction projects near receptors, the following control measures:  
  - Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.  
  - Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than one percent.  
  - To the extent feasible, limit area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activity at any one time.  
  - Limit the area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activity at any one time. |
| 4.3-3(c) | The campus shall implement the following control measures to reduce emissions of ozone precursors from construction equipment exhaust:  
  - To the extent that equipment is available and cost effective, the campus shall encourage contractors to use alternate fuels and retrofit existing engines in construction equipment.  
  - Minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes when construction equipment is not in use.  
  - To the extent practicable, manage operation of heavy-duty equipment to reduce emissions.  
  - To the extent practicable, employ construction management techniques such as timing construction to occur outside the ozone season of May through October, or scheduling equipment use to limit unnecessary concurrent operation. |
| 4.3-6 | Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.3-1(a-c). |
| 4.3-8 | EPA and CARB are expected to continue the development and implement programs to reduce air toxics, and UC Davis will continue its efforts in this area. |

### 7.3.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion
AIR QUALITY

Would the project…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact for which 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a,b,c,d) **Construction**

The 2003 LRDP EIR found that construction activities under the 2003 LRDP could exceed YSAQMD thresholds (Impact 4.3-3). The state 24-hour PM₁₀ standards could be violated when multiple construction projects (especially those involving ongoing grading or excavation activities) occur simultaneously in the same area. Housing or other sensitive receptors located adjacent to construction areas could be affected by high concentrations of PM₁₀. In addition, exhaust pollutants would be emitted during use of construction equipment.

In terms of sensitive receptors on or adjacent to the project site, the School of Law has a small parent co-operative nursery for the infants of law school students; up to six infants are accommodated in the nursery while their parents attend classes (King Hall 2006). The nursery would remain in place during the construction of the addition (the first phase of the proposed project), and would be temporarily relocated during the second phase, the renovation of the existing building. Construction of the proposed project would disturb an area of less than 2 acres. Other, possibly simultaneous construction projects could include the Reflective Area for the Project to Honor Native Americans, immediately south of the project site, and the Physical Sciences Expansion project, to the west of the project site. The proposed project would involve the short-term emission of exhaust pollutants from heavy construction equipment. Construction of the project would include grading, excavation, off-site hauling, and concrete pouring, among other typical construction activities. The project would require demolition of the northeast exit stair tower and opening up some exterior walls in order to build the addition. Construction of the proposed project would be expected to take approximately two years.

Air intakes are located on the northwest corner of the existing building, next to the loading dock, at ground level. The air intakes would be protected from any fugitive emissions during construction of the proposed project. LRDP Mitigation 4.3-3(a) (requiring campus construction contracts to include measures to reduce fugitive dust impacts), 4.3-3(b) (requiring additional specific dust control measures), and 4.4-3(c) (requiring control measures to reduce emissions of ozone precursors from construction equipment exhaust) are relevant in the proposed project. However, the proposed project would involve the short-term emission of exhaust pollutants from construction equipment.
The 2003 LRDP EIR found that the impact of the cumulative emissions from the totality of projects under construction at any given time under the 2003 LRDP would be significant and unavoidable. The impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information has become available since certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR that would alter this previous analysis.

**Operation**

**Criteria Pollutants**

The proposed project would not increase the campus population and would not increase the number or length of motor vehicle trips associated with the School of Law. If the project were to choose the heating option of a boiler and/or the cooling option of a trailer mounted air cooled chilled water system or evaporative chiller next to the existing building (as described in the Project Description, Section 3.5.4, Utilities and Infrastructure), that option would create a stationary source of criteria pollutant emissions associated with the proposed project. This option has been used for another building on campus. The operational emissions would not exceed the YSAQMD significance thresholds, based on analysis presented in the 2003 LRDP EIR for the Chilled Water Facilities Expansion project (pages 6-29 and 6-30 of Volume III). Appropriate coordination with the YSAQMD regarding obtaining any necessary permits would be part of the project design process, depending upon which of the alternatives for heating and cooling are chosen.

The 2003 LRDP EIR found that operational emissions under the 2003 LRDP could substantially contribute to violation of ambient state and federal air quality standards or hinder the attainment of the regional air quality plan (LRDP Impact 4.3-1). The project would contribute to this impact. The campus is located in an area that is in nonattainment of O₃ and PM₁₀ standards. The Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan, which covers the campus, contains strategies for lowering the region's emissions to meet the O₃ standard by 2005. However, campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 is not addressed by the current Clean Air Plan. LRDP Mitigation 4.3-1 (a-b), which includes measures that encourage alternative transportation and no- or low-emission building designs and operations, would help reduce daily emissions from campus vehicular and stationary sources. LRDP Mitigation 4.3-1(c) would ensure that the campus will coordinate with the YSAQMD during the update of the Clean Air Plan and other applicable air quality planning efforts. However, given the likelihood of exceedance of O₃ standards even with mitigation, it appears that the implementation of the 2003 LRDP, including the proposed project, could potentially hinder the attainment of the regional air quality plan. The impact is therefore considered significant and unavoidable at the LRDP program level. This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information has become available since certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR that would alter this previous analysis.

**Toxic Air Contaminants**

The proposed project would provide office and instructional space for the existing population level of students and faculty. The project is not expected to result in increased motor vehicle use. The project would not include lab space and would not emit toxic air contaminants. No impact would occur.

**Cumulative Development**
The 2003 LRDP EIR found that implementation of the 2003 LRDP, in conjunction with other regional development, would contribute to emissions of criteria pollutants for which the region is in non-attainment status and could hinder attainment efforts (LRDP Impact 4.3-6). The YSAQMD has accounted for a certain amount of regional growth in the existing Sacramento Regional Clean Air Plan. This plan is currently being updated to extend beyond the year 2005, and campus growth under the 2003 LRDP will be incorporated in the plan update. LRDP Mitigation 4.3-6, included in the proposed project, requires implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.3-1 (a-c). Regardless, because the YSAQMD remains a nonattainment area for ozone, this cumulative impact is considered significant and unavoidable. This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information has become available since certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR that would alter this previous analysis.

e) The proposed project would not generate additional objectionable odors on campus and would not expose users to objectionable odors. No impact would occur.

Summary

Mitigation measures 4.3-1(a-c), 4.3-3(a-c), 4.3-6, and 4.3-8 from the 2003 LRDP EIR are relevant to the proposed project and reduce the significance of air quality impacts to the extent feasible. The proposed project would not exceed the levels of significance of air quality impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant air quality impacts that were not previously addressed.
7.4 Biological Resources

7.4.1 Background

Section 4.4 of the 2003 LRDP EIR addresses the effects of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP on biological resources. The following discussion summarizes information presented in the ‘Setting’ subsection of Section 4.4 of the 2003 LRDP EIR.

Campus

The 5,300-acre campus is located in a region that is composed primarily of agricultural lands that include remnant riparian areas and urban areas. Habitat types on campus can be classified as Agricultural Lands (including Cropland/Pasture, and Orchard/Vineyard), Valley Foothill Riparian Woodland, Ruderal/Annual Grassland, Open Water Ponds, Riverine, and Urban Landscaping/Developed.

The 2003 LRDP EIR considers special status species to be those taxa that are: (1) listed as threatened or endangered under either the California or Federal Endangered Species Acts; (2) candidates for either state or federal listing; (3) species afforded protection under the Fish and Game Code of California; (4) federal and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) “Species of Special Concern”; (5) CDFG “Species of Special Concern” highest and second priority lists; (6) and California Native Plant Society (CNPS) List 1-3 plants.

A database search identified 15 special status plant species, 8 special status invertebrates, 11 special status fish, 3 special status amphibians, 3 special status reptiles, 26 special status birds, and 7 special status mammals that have the potential to occur on or within a 10-mile radius of the campus. However, only a few of these species are known to occur on campus or have potential habitat present on campus, including: the northern California black walnut, burrowing owl, Swainson’s hawk, valley elderberry longhorn beetle, California tiger salamander, chinook salmon, giant garter snake, steelhead, and the northwestern pond turtle.

Project Site

The project site is characterized in the 2003 LRDP as urban landscaping/developed habitat. Because of the need to move some utility lines as part of the proposed project, the project site and the area south of the site, adjacent to the Arboretum, were surveyed for the presence of elderberry shrubs, which provide potential valley elderberry longhorn beetle habitat. No elderberry shrubs were identified on or within a 100-foot zone adjacent to the project site (Fulks 2006).

Habitat

Urban Landscaping/Developed. Urban habitat includes landscaped areas that are vegetated with trees, shrubs, and maintained grassy areas. While the University Arboretum contains a significant collection of botanical specimens, it is included within this habitat designation because it is essentially a landscaped park with many non-native plantings, and is subject to regular maintenance as well as high frequency use by people (picnicking, jogging, walking, etc.).

Central campus landscaped areas, with their abundance of mature trees, provide wildlife habitat values (food and cover) within the developed areas of central campus. Many species of birds (including the Swainson’s hawk) are known to nest in central campus trees. Other resident and migratory hawks, owls, songbirds, and woodpeckers are also known to use landscaped areas on the campus for nesting, food, and cover.
Special Status Species

Swainson’s Hawk. The Swainson’s hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*) is listed as a threatened species under the California Endangered Species Act and is also fully protected against take pursuant to Section 3503.5 of the Fish and Game Code of California. The Swainson’s hawk is a relatively large bird of prey that typically nests in large trees in riparian corridors as well as isolated trees remaining in or adjacent to agricultural fields in the Central Valley. However, in the City of Davis, and on the central campus, these hawks also nest in the large trees among buildings, roads, and dwellings.

This species forages in open grassland habitats and has adjusted to foraging in certain types of agricultural lands. The value of foraging habitat can be affected by a variety of characteristics, including density and availability of prey, proximity to disturbing features, and distance to nesting territories. Published information indicates these raptors typically forage within a 10 mile radius of nest sites but may range up to 18 miles from a nest site in search of suitable foraging habitat and available prey. Formal studies have shown that Swainson’s hawks will spend the majority of foraging time in close proximity to the nest site when high quality foraging habitat (measured by the abundance and availability of prey) is present.

The occurrence of the Swainson’s hawk in and around the campus is well documented. UC Davis conducted yearly surveys for Swainson’s hawk nests on the campus and within one half mile of the campus from 1991 through 1998. Project-specific surveys have been conducted annually since 1998. The results of these surveys documented approximately 20 active nests per year and a total of approximately 50 total nests within one-half mile of the campus over the decade. Most of the Swainson’s hawk nests are located in the Putah Creek riparian corridor.

Trees

A tree survey of the proposed site was conducted in accordance with the campus practice for identifying trees to preserve during a development or redevelopment project. Ten trees of heritage or specimen status were identified for preservation; the project design would incorporate preservation of all ten trees. Placement and installation of the chilled water and steam utility lines would also preserve these trees. The proposed project would landscape the grounds of the project site, including planting trees, in a style fitting the site context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Number Present on Site</th>
<th>Number to be Removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European White Birch (<em>Betula pendula</em>)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River She-Oak (<em>Casuarina cunninghamiana</em>)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Iron Bark (<em>Eucalyptus sideroxylon</em>)</td>
<td>2 (may require removal)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossy Privet (<em>Ligustrum lucidum</em>)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crabapple (<em>Malus spp.</em>)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olive (<em>Olea europaea</em>)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Flowering Cherry (<em>Prunus spp.</em>)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental Pear (<em>Pyrus calleryana</em>)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Pear (<em>Pyrus kawakamii</em>)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Oak (<em>Quercus lobata</em>)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork Oak (<em>Quercus suber</em>)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Redwood (<em>Sequoia sempervirens</em>)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Trees</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29 to 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4.2 2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance

The 2003 LRDP EIR considers a biological resources impact significant if growth under the 2003 LRDP would:

- Result in 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 (CDFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).
- Result in the “take” (defined as kill, harm, or harass) of any listed threatened or endangered species or the habitat of such species.
- Result in a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the CDFG or USFWS.
- Result in a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.
- 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.
- Conflict with any local applicable policies protecting biological resources.

An additional standard from the CEQA Guidelines' Environmental Checklist (“f” in the checklist below) was found not applicable to campus growth under the 2003 LRDP.

7.4.3 2003 LRDP EIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on biological resources are evaluated in Section 4.4 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. As analyzed in Section 4 of this Initial Study, the proposed project is within the scope of analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR. Significant and potentially significant biological resources impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are relevant to the proposed project are presented below with their corresponding levels of significance before and after application of mitigation measures identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2003 LRDP EIR Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4-4</td>
<td>Development allowed under the 2003 LRDP could result in the failure of nesting efforts by nesting raptors, including Swainson’s hawks or other birds of prey.</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4-5</td>
<td>Development allowed under the 2003 LRDP would result in the loss of active nest sites for Swainson’s hawk.</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.4-11                 | Development under the 2003 LRDP could result in the removal of trees recognized to meet the campus’ standards for important trees, including: | PS | a. SU
  a. Heritage Trees: Healthy valley oak trees with trunk diameters of 33 inches or greater at a height of 34 inches from the ground. | b. LS |
Mitigation measures in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are applicable to the proposed project are presented below. Since these mitigation measures are already being carried out as part of implementation of the 2003 LRDP, they will not be readopted in this Initial Study or Negative Declaration. The benefits of these mitigation measures will be achieved independently of considering them as specific mitigation measures of this project. Nothing in this Initial Study in any way alters the obligations of the campus to implement 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures.

### 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

#### BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

| 4.4-4(a) | The campus shall conduct a pre-construction survey of trees on and adjacent to a project site during the raptor breeding season (approximately March 1 to August 31). Additionally, the campus shall conduct surveys within a ½-mile radius of the site to determine the presence or absence of any nesting Swainson’s hawks. The surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the same calendar year that the proposed activity is planned to begin to determine if any nesting birds-of-prey would be affected. If phased construction procedures are planned for the proposed activity, the results of the above survey shall be valid only for the season when it is conducted.

If any Swainson’s hawks are nesting within a one-half-mile radius of the project site or if other raptors are nesting in, on or adjacent to the project site, a qualified biologist shall determine the potential for disturbance to nesting raptors, including Swainson’s hawks. If the biologist determines that there is a significant potential for disturbance, the campus shall implement feasible changes in the construction schedule or make other appropriate adjustments to the project in response to the specific circumstances. If feasible project changes are not readily identifiable, the campus will consult with CDFG to determine what actions should be taken to protect the nesting efforts. If, after five years, a previously recorded nest site remains unoccupied by a Swainson’s hawk, it will no longer be considered as a Swainson’s hawk nest site subject to this mitigation.

| 4.4-4(b) | The campus shall continue to conduct annual surveys to determine the location of nesting Swainson’s hawks and other birds of prey on the campus outside the Putah Creek corridor. If nesting Swainson’s hawks are found during the survey at a previously unknown location within one-half mile of a project site and/or at a location closer to the project or more visually exposed to the project site than a nearby previously documented site, a qualified biologist shall, prior to project construction, determine the potential for disturbance to nesting Swainson’s hawks. If the biologist determines that there is a significant potential for disturbance, the campus shall implement feasible changes in the construction schedule or make other appropriate adjustments to the project in response to the specific circumstances (e.g. relocating noisy equipment or creating temporary sound barriers).

The implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.4-4(a) and (b) shall be conducted under the supervision of a biologist whose qualifications include:

- A bachelor’s degree in biology or a related field;
- Two years of field experience related to nesting raptors; and
- Prior construction monitoring experience.

Further:

- All decisions of the qualified biologist shall be made in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game;
- Monitoring shall be conducted for a sufficient time (minimum of 3 consecutive days following the initiation of construction) to verify that the nesting pair does not exhibit significant adverse reaction to construction activities (i.e., changes in behavioral patterns, reactions to construction noise, etc.); and
- Nest site monitoring will continue for a minimum of once a week through the nesting cycle at that nest.
2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

4.4-5 Mitigation 4.4-4(a) and (b) will be implemented, including pre-construction survey of trees on and adjacent to a project site during the raptor breeding season (approximately March 1 to August 31). If a Swainson’s hawk nest tree is present, the tree will be removed outside the nesting season (March-May).

4.4-11 Before a project is approved under the 2003 LRDP, the campus will perform a tree survey of the project site. Grounds, the Office of Resource Management and Planning, and the Office of Architects and Engineers will provide input about tree classifications and will modify project design to avoid important trees if feasible. If a project cannot avoid an important tree, the following will apply:

a. If a project would necessitate removal of a Heritage Tree, no mitigation would be available to fully mitigate the impact, and the impact would be significant and unavoidable. However, implementation of Mitigation 4.4-2 would restore Valley Foothill Riparian Woodland habitat at Russell Ranch, and plantings in this area would include valley oaks.

b. If a project would necessitate removal of a Specimen Tree, the project would relocate the tree if feasible, or would replace the tree with the same species or species of comparable value (relocation or replacement should occur within the project area if feasible). This would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

---

### 7.4.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project…</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact for which 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of 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>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</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>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</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>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</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>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a) **Plants**

The 2003 LRDP EIR found that development under the 2003 LRDP could result in the loss of special-status plant species (LRDP Impact 4.4-1). The project site is developed, much of it is in lawn, and is highly disturbed, consequently, the site does not support suitable habitat for special status species potentially found on the UC Davis campus.

b,c) There are no riparian or wetland areas on the project site. No impact would occur.

d) The Putah Creek corridor, which forms the southern boundary of the campus, is the principal corridor for the movement of native resident and migratory fish and wildlife through the UC Davis campus. It is the regional connection between the hills in western Yolo County and the Sacramento River. The project site is approximately one mile north of the Putah Creek corridor. Therefore, the project would not interfere 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 would occur.

e) Pursuant to LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.4-11, the campus performs a tree survey of a project site prior to project approval, and modifies the project design to the extent feasible to avoid tree removal or provide additional mitigation if removal of heritage or specimen trees cannot be avoided. The campus performed a tree survey of the project site. The survey documented 58 trees on the project site, of which ten were rated as heritage or specimen trees. The proposed project would remove between 29 and 31 of the site trees, though none of the ten heritage or specimen trees would be removed. The project would plant trees as part of the landscaping plan for the renovation and expansion project. The chilled water and steam utility line upgrades would be routed to avoid removal of heritage trees and to avoid, to the extent feasible, removal of specimen trees. Should the utility line routes require removal of specimen trees, the feasibility of relocating those trees will be assessed before removal. Two ornamental shrubs, a *Ternstroemia gymnanthera* and a *Cotoneaster lacteus*, were identified in the tree survey as being worthy of protection or relocation as horticultural specimens, if possible. The project would have to remove these shrubs, but an attempt to relocate them will be assessed for feasibility before removal. For site trees to be retained, protection in place will be provided as part of the construction contract specifications, including any trees near possible construction staging areas. The impact would be less than significant.
f) The campus does not fall within the boundaries of, nor is it adjacent to, an adopted regional Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) or Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP). The campus has implemented two low effects HCPs for Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle at Russell Ranch. The project site is not located at Russell Ranch. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with an adopted HCP or NCCP. No impact would occur.

Summary

Mitigation measures 4.4-4(a-b), 4.4-5, and 4.4-11 from the 2003 LRDP EIR are relevant to the proposed project and reduce the significance of impacts on biological resources to the extent feasible. The proposed project would not exceed the levels of significance of biological resource impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant biological resource impacts that were not previously addressed.
7.5 **Cultural Resources**

7.5.1 **Background**

Section 4.5 of the 2003 LRDP EIR addresses the effects of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP on cultural resources. The following discussion summarizes information presented in the ‘Setting’ subsection of Section 4.5 of the 2003 LRDP EIR.

**Campus**

Cultural resources on campus include prehistoric and historic resources. Prehistoric resources are those sites and artifacts associated with the indigenous, non-Euroamerican population, generally dating prior to contact with people of European descent. Historic resources include structures, features, artifacts, and sites that date from Euroamerican settlement of the region.

**Archaeological Resources**

The campus lies in the ethnographic territory of the Patwin. Since 1991, extensive archaeological investigations (survey, testing, monitoring, and/or excavation) have been conducted on campus in conjunction with the development of campus projects (Nadolski 2003). Patwin sites, including burials, have been identified at several locations on the central campus. Areas within 800 feet of the banks of the historic channel of Putah Creek and its tributaries and slough channels, and within 800 feet of specific known archaeological sites, have been identified as archaeologically sensitive zones on campus.

**Historic Resources**

The earliest direct historic contacts in the Davis area probably occurred during 1806 to 1808. Farming on a large scale began in the Davis area in the 1850s. A “university farm” was established at Davis in 1906, classes began in 1909, and Davis became a general University of California campus in 1959. No properties within the campus are listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Six properties on or near the campus have been recorded with the California Inventory of Historic Resources. Historic architectural features typically must be at least 50 years of age to be considered for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).

**Project Site**

No historic resources exist on or adjacent to the project site. The project site is within an archaeologically sensitive zone along the former Putah Creek channel, as determined by the 2003 LRDP EIR. An archaeological investigation, which included archival research, a surface inspection, and subsurface auger testing, was completed for the project site (Pacific Legacy 2006). No intact cultural deposits or features were identified in the project area.

7.5.2 **2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance**

In addition to the following archaeological and historical standards of significance identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR, an additional standard from the CEQA Guidelines’ Environmental Checklist (“c” in the checklist below) was found not applicable to campus growth under the 2003 LRDP.

**Archaeological Resources**
The 2003 LRDP EIR considers an impact on archaeological resources significant if growth under the 2003 LRDP would:

- Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guideline § 15064.5.
- Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

A “unique archaeological resource” is defined under CEQA through Public Resources Code Section 21083.2(g). A unique archaeological resource implies an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that there is a high probability that it meets one of the following criteria:

- The archaeological artifact, object, or site contains information needed to answer important scientific questions and there is a demonstrable public interest in that information, or
- The archaeological artifact, object, or site has a special and particular quality, such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type, or
- The archaeological artifact, object, or site is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

For a resource to qualify as a unique archaeological resource, the agency must determine that there is a high probability that the resource meets one of these criteria without merely adding to the current body of knowledge (PRC § 21083.2(g)). An archaeological artifact, object, or site that does not meet the above criteria is a nonunique archaeological resource (PRC § 21083.2(h)). An impact on a nonunique resource is not a significant environmental impact under CEQA (CEQA Guideline § 15064.5(c)(4)). If an archaeological resource qualifies as a historical resource under CRHR or other criteria, then the resource is treated as a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA (CEQA Guideline § 15064.5(c)(2)).

Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines assigns special importance to human remains and specifies procedures to be used when Native American remains are discovered. These procedures are detailed under PRC § 5097.98. California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5(b) prohibits disturbance of human remains uncovered by excavation until the Coroner has made a finding relative to PRC § 5097 procedures.

**Historical Resources**

For the purposes of this EIR, as mandated by PRC § 21083.2, impacts of the proposed project on an historical resource would be considered significant if it would:

- cause a significant adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guideline § 15064.5.

The standards of significance for historical resources are based on Appendix G and § 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Accordingly, historical resources include resources listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the CRHR; resources included in a qualifying local register (such as the City of Davis Register of Historic Resources); and resources that the lead agency determines to meet the criteria for listing in the CRHR. These criteria may apply to any historic built environmental feature, and to historic or prehistoric archaeological sites. Properties or sites that are eligible for inclusion in the CRHR are termed “historical resources”. Under the provisions of CEQA Guideline Section
generally a lead agency should find that a property is historically significant if it determines that the property meets one or more of the criteria for listing on the CRHR, which extend to any building, structure, feature or site that:

- is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- is associated with lives of persons important in our past;
- embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

With few exceptions, to qualify as a historical resource a property must be at least 50 years old and also must retain physical integrity and integrity to its period of significance. For historic structures and buildings, significantly altering the setting, remodeling, or moving the structure may diminish or destroy its integrity. However, under some conditions, a building that has been moved or altered may still retain its historic significance. Landscaping or landscape features may in some cases contribute to the significance of an historic architectural property. Such elements would be assessed as part of the evaluation of the related historic architectural property. Archaeological sites may also qualify as historical resources under CEQA Guideline Section 15064.5(a)(3). Archaeological sites most often are assessed relative to CRHR Criterion D (for potential to yield data important to history or prehistory). An archaeological deposit that has been extensively disturbed and archaeological artifacts found in isolation may not be eligible for listing on the CRHR, because the lack of stratigraphic context may reduce the potential for the resource to yield significant data. A resource that does not meet one of the criteria for eligibility to the CRHR is not a historical resource under CEQA, and impacts to such a property are not significant.

### 7.5.3 2003 LRDP EIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on cultural resources are evaluated in Section 4.5 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. As analyzed in Section 4 of this Initial Study, the proposed project is within the scope of analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR. Significant and potentially significant cultural resources impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are relevant to the proposed project are presented below with their corresponding levels of significance before and after application of mitigation measures identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR. Mitigation measures are included to reduce the magnitude of project-level impact 4.5-3 and cumulative impact 4.5-5, but these impacts are identified as significant and unavoidable because they cannot be fully mitigated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2003 LRDP EIR Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL RESOURCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5-1</td>
<td>Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could damage or destroy an archaeological resource or historic building or structure as the result of grading, excavation, ground disturbance or other project development.</td>
<td>PS LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5-2</td>
<td>Implementation of the LRDP could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or unique archaeological resource, as defined in CEQA guidelines 15064.5, as the result of ground disturbance, alteration, removal or demolition associated with project development.</td>
<td>PS LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5-3</td>
<td>Implementation of the LRDP could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource or unique archaeological resource, as defined in CEQA guidelines 15064.5, and the values that contribute to the</td>
<td>S SU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mitigation measures in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are applicable to the proposed project are presented below. Since these mitigation measures are already being carried out as part of implementation of the 2003 LRDP, they will not be readopted in this Initial Study or Negative Declaration. The benefits of these mitigation measures will be achieved independently of considering them as specific mitigation measures of this project. Nothing in this Initial Study in any way alters the obligations of the campus to implement 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures.
shall be adjusted in accordance with survey results, the nature of construction activities, and results during the monitoring period. In the event of a discovery, the campus shall implement item (vi), below.

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

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

(v) If a resource within the project APE is determined to qualify as an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource (as defined by CEQA), the campus shall consult with the qualified archaeologist to consider means of avoiding or reducing ground disturbance within the site boundaries, including minor modifications of building footprint, landscape modification, the placement of protective fill, the establishment of a preservation easement, or other means that will permit avoidance or substantial preservation in place of the resource. If avoidance or substantial preservation in place is not possible, the campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation 4.5-2(a).

(vi) If a resource is discovered during construction (whether or not an archaeologist is present), all soil disturbing work within 100 feet of the find shall cease. The campus shall contact a qualified archaeologist to provide and implement a plan for survey, subsurface investigation as needed to define the deposit, and assessment of the remainder of the site within the project area to determine whether the resource is significant and would be affected by the project. LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(b), steps (iii) through (vii) shall be implemented.

(vii) A written report of the results of investigations will be prepared by a qualified archaeologist and filed with the appropriate Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System.

4.5-2(a) For an archaeological site that has been determined by a qualified archaeologist to qualify as an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource through the process set forth under LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(b), and where it has been determined under LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(b) that avoidance or preservation in place is not feasible, a qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the campus, shall:

(i) Prepare a research design and archaeological data recovery plan for the recovery that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant, and implement the data recovery plan prior to or during development of the site.

(ii) Perform appropriate technical analyses, prepare a full written report and file it with the appropriate information center, and provide for the permanent curation of recovered materials.

(iii) If, in the opinion of the qualified archaeologist and in light of the data available, the significance of the site is such that data recovery cannot capture the values that qualify the site for inclusion on the CRHR, the campus shall reconsider project plans in light of the high value of the resource, and implement more substantial modifications to the proposed project that would allow the site to be preserved intact, such as project redesign, placement of fill, or project relocation or abandonment. If no such measures are feasible, the campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation 4.5-3.

4.5-3 If a significant historic resource or unique archaeological resource cannot be preserved intact, before the property is damaged or destroyed the campus shall ensure that the resource is appropriately documented, as follows.

(i) For a built environment feature, appropriate documentation is described under LRDP 4.5-2(b)

(ii) For an archaeological site, a program of research-directed data recovery shall be conducted and reported, consistent with LRDP Mitigation 4.5-2(a).

4.5-4(a) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1, 4.5-2 and 4.5-3 to minimize the potential for disturbance or destruction of human remains in an archaeological context and to preserve them in place, if feasible.

4.5-4(b) Provide a representative of the local Native American community an opportunity to monitor any excavation (including archaeological excavation) within the boundaries of a known Native American archaeological site.
2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures
CULTURAL RESOURCES

4.5-4(c) In the event of a discovery on campus of human bone, suspected human bone, or a burial, all excavation in the vicinity will halt immediately and the area of the find will be protected until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the bone is human. If the qualified archaeologist determines the bone is human, or if a qualified archaeologist is not present, the campus will notify the Yolo or Solano County Coroner (depending on the county of the find) of the find before additional disturbance occurs. Consistent with California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5(b), which prohibits disturbance of human remains uncovered by excavation until the Coroner has made a finding relative to PRC 5097 procedures, the campus will ensure that the remains and vicinity of the find are protected against further disturbance. If it is determined that the find is of Native American origin, the campus will comply with the provisions of PRC § 5097.98 regarding identification and involvement of the Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD).

4.5-4(d) If human remains cannot be left in place, the campus shall ensure that the qualified archaeologist and the MLD are provided opportunity to confer on archaeological treatment of human remains, and that appropriate studies, as identified through this consultation, are carried out prior to reinterment. The campus shall provide results of all such studies to the local Native American community, and shall provide an opportunity of local Native American involvement in any interpretative reporting. As stipulated by the provisions of the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, the campus shall ensure that human remains and associated artifacts recovered from campus projects on state lands are repatriated to the appropriate local tribal group if requested.

4.5-5 Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.5-1 through 4.5-4.

7.5.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTURAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact for which 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) There are no historical resources on the project site. No impact would occur.

b) The 2003 LRDP EIR identified that development under the 2003 LRDP could damage or destroy archaeological resources as a result of grading, excavation, ground disturbance or other project development (LRDP Impact 4.5-1). This risk is highest on campus along the historic banks of the tributaries and slough channels of Putah Creek and in the vicinity of previously discovered archaeological sites. The project site is near the historic Putah Creek channel, which is now the Arboretum Waterway. To implement Mitigation Measure 4.5-1(a), the site was subjected to surface and subsurface testing by a qualified archaeologist: no intact cultural resources were found. Since the project site is within an archaeologically sensitive zone designated pursuant to the 2003 LRDP EIR, archaeological monitoring of the initial and deeper ground disturbing project construction activities will be conducted to insure that any potential cultural resources are protected, following the guidelines outlined in Mitigation Measure 4.5-1(b). If any archaeological resources are uncovered as a result of construction activities for the proposed project, Mitigation
Measures 4.5-2(a) and 4.5-3 will be implemented to document and protect such resources to the extent possible.

The 2003 LRDP EIR identified that development under the 2003 LRDP would contribute to the cumulative damage to and loss of archaeological resources in Yolo and Solano counties (LRDP Impact 4.5-5). Because any disturbance of native soils involves the potential to result in impacts to archaeological resources, the proposed project could contribute to this impact. LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.5-5, which is relevant to the proposed project, requires the campus to implement the measures discussed above to survey and project cultural resources. However, the University cannot ensure that other regional jurisdictions would act to protect cultural resources. In addition, it is possible that significant archaeological resources on campus and/or the region could not be protected. Because this impact cannot be fully mitigated, this cumulative impact is considered significant and unavoidable. This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information has become available since certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR that would alter this previous analysis.

c) During the course of development at UC Davis, extensive excavation for buildings and infrastructure, and extensive agricultural operations have not revealed the presence of unique paleontological or geological resources. It appears that the campus lacks unique paleontological and geological resources due to the deep alluvial deposition of fairly uniform soil types in the area. No impact would occur, and no additional analysis is required.

d) The 2003 LRDP EIR found the potential for development under the 2003 LRDP to disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries (LRDP Impact 4.5-4). LRDP Mitigation 4.5-4(a-d), included in the proposed project, would ensure that human remains in archaeological and isolated contexts would be protected from destruction that might take place from development through measures including identification, Native American consultation, preservation in place or recovery, respectful treatment and study, and reinterment. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Summary

Mitigation measures 4.5-1(a-b), 4.5-2(a), 4.5-3, 4.5-4(a-d), and 4.5-5 from the 2003 LRDP EIR are relevant to the proposed project and reduce the significance of impacts on cultural resources to the extent feasible. The proposed project would not exceed the levels of significance of cultural resource impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant cultural resource impacts that were not previously addressed.
7.6 **Geology, Soils, & Seismicity**

7.6.1 **Background**

Section 4.6 of the 2003 LRDP EIR addresses the geology, soils, and seismicity effects of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP. The following discussion summarizes information presented in the ‘Setting’ subsection of Section 4.6 of the 2003 LRDP EIR.

**Campus**

The campus is located within the Putah Creek Plain of California’s Great Valley geomorphic province. Except for the somewhat raised elevation along the levee adjacent to Putah Creek, the campus is topographically flat. Soils on campus generally contain a high amount of silt and clay, and as a result, are moderately to slowly permeable and have slow runoff rates, minimal erosion hazards, and moderate to high shrink-swell potential. The predominant soil constraint to construction on campus is soil shrink-swell potential (the potential for soil volume to change with a loss or gain in moisture).

A series of low foothills, including the Dunnigan Hills, the Capay Hills, and the English Hills, lie approximately 20 miles west of the campus at the eastern base of the Coast Range. The presence of subsurface thrust faults within these regional foothills and within 100 miles of the campus indicates the potential for seismic ground shaking in the Davis region. The Davis region is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone as defined in the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, which is designed to prohibit the construction of structures for human occupancy across active faults. According to the California Geological Survey’s Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Assessment for the State of California, the peak ground acceleration with a 10 percent probability of being exceeded in 50 years is 0.2 to 0.3g on the central campus, increasing to 0.3 to 0.4g on the western portion of Russell Ranch (CDOC 1996). By comparison, in most parts of the San Francisco Bay Area, the peak ground acceleration is 0.5g or greater. Likely effects of ground shaking during a probable maximum intensity earthquake for the area could include structural damage to stucco, masonry walls, and chimneys, which could expose people to risks associated with falling objects and potential building collapse.

**Project Site**

Topographic relief on the project site is largely of human design. A geotechnical study will be performed for the project. The engineering and design process for the project facilities will incorporate the findings from the geotechnical survey to ensure adequate design for compliance with the California Building Code.

7.6.2 **2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance**

The 2003 LRDP EIR considers an impact related to geology, soils, and seismicity significant if growth under the 2003 LRDP would:

- Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving strong seismic ground shaking.
- Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic-related ground failure.
- Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. (Impacts associated with this standard are addressed in Section 7.8 Hydrology & Water Quality.)
• 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 offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

• Be located on expansive soil, creating substantial risks to life or property.

• 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.

Additional standards from the CEQA Guidelines’ Environmental Checklist (“a,i” and “a,iv” in the checklist below) were found not applicable to campus growth under the 2003 LRDP.

### 7.6.3 2003 LRDP EIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 related to geology, soils, and seismicity are evaluated in Section 4.6 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. As analyzed in Section 4 of this Initial Study, the proposed project is within the scope of analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR. No significant impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR related to geology, soils, and seismicity are relevant to the proposed project.

### 7.6.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOLOGY, SOILS, &amp; SEISMICITY</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact for which 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?

a,i) The UC Davis campus and the surrounding area are not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and the closest known active fault rupture zones are over 30 miles away. Therefore, no impact would occur and no further analysis is required.

a,ii) The campus is located in a seismically active area that could experience ground shaking, liquefaction, and settlement. The peak ground acceleration for the main campus is estimated to be 0.2 to 0.3g, and 0.3 to 0.4g on the western portion of Russell Ranch. This intensity of seismic groundshaking has the potential to dislodge objects from shelves and to damage or destroy buildings and other structures. In the case of such a seismic event, people on campus and in the area would be exposed to these hazards.

The campus minimizes hazards associated with damage or destruction to buildings and other structures by reviewing and approving all draft building plans for compliance with the California Building Code (CBC), which includes specific structural seismic safety provisions. The campus also adheres to the University of California Seismic Safety Policy, which requires anchorage for seismic resistance of nonstructural building elements such as furnishings, fixtures, material storage facilities, and utilities that could create a hazard if dislodged during an earthquake. Campus EH&S provides guidance for preparing department-level Illness and Injury Prevention Plans that emphasize methods for minimizing seismic hazards in laboratories, for example, by properly securing chemical containers and gas cylinders. Each campus department has a Safety Coordinator who develops and maintains a departmental emergency response plan. The departmental emergency response plans must be submitted to the Emergency Preparedness Policy Group for annual review to assure consistency with the campus Emergency Operations Plan, which includes seismic safety and building evacuation procedures. The emergency procedures incorporated into the departmental emergency response plans further reduce the hazards from seismic shaking by preparing faculty, staff, and students for emergencies. All of these procedures would be implemented as part of the proposed project. Therefore, the project-level impact associated with risks due to seismic ground shaking would be less than significant. In addition, it is reasonable to assume that all regional jurisdictions would enforce the seismic provisions of the CBC, and therefore the cumulative impact is also considered less than significant.

a,iii) The potential for liquefaction on the campus is generally low because the depth to groundwater is relatively large (30 to 80 feet, depending on the season). Furthermore, as discussed above for (a,ii), campus policy requires compliance with the CBC and the University of California Seismic Safety Policy, which include structural and nonstructural seismic safety provisions. Complying with the provisions of the CBC requires that a geotechnical investigation be performed to provide data for the architect and/or engineer to responsibly design the project. Geotechnical investigations address the potential for liquefaction, lateral spreading, and other types of ground failure. Therefore, because, in compliance with campus procedure, the project will comply with the CBC and the University of California Seismic Safety Policy, impacts associated with seismic-related ground failure would be less than significant.

The Davis area subsided by approximately 2 inches between 1999 and 2002. Because the subsidence is regional, unlike local differential settlement, it would not affect building foundations. Subsidence can adversely affect utilities such as storm drains which rely on gradient for gravity-driven flow if the differential subsidence across the length of the pipeline causes the gradient of the pipelines to change direction. On the campus, the differential subsidence is about 0.4 inch per mile. Thus, over a period of 10 years, the gradient of a pipeline could change by as
much as 4 inches per mile. Gravity-driven pipelines typically used for wastewater and storm water are designed with gradients between 0.5 and 1 percent (27 to 53 feet drop per mile). Given these gradients, the small potential change of about 4 inches per mile over a period of 10 years would not affect the functioning of existing and proposed storm drains or other utilities.

a,iv) The UC Davis campus and the surrounding area are characterized by flat topography and therefore would not be subject to landslides. Therefore, no impact would occur and no further analysis is required.

b) The soil types that occur on the UC Davis campus generally, including the project site, contain a high amount of silt and clay, and these soil types have minimal erosion hazard associated with them (see pages 4.6-1,2 and Figure 4.6-1 of the 2003 LRDP EIR). Therefore, this impact was determined to be less than significant in the 2003 LRDP EIR. The relationship between receiving water quality and potential soil erosion as a result of construction activities is addressed in items (a) and (c) in Section 7.8 Hydrology & Water Quality.

c) See the discussion in item (a,iii) above.

d) The soils in several areas of the campus have high shrink/swell potential and could, on a site-specific basis, have the potential to create risk to life or property. Campus policy requires compliance with the CBC, which includes provisions for construction on expansive soils such as proper fill selection, moisture control, and compaction during construction. Complying with the provisions of the CBC requires that a geotechnical investigation be performed to provide data for the architect and/or engineer to responsibly design the project. The project will comply with the CBC, which will ensure that this impact is less than significant.

e) The 2003 LRDP EIR identifies that an impact would result if soils are incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are included in the proposed project, and there would be no impact.

Summary

The proposed project would not exceed the levels of significance of geology, soils, and seismicity impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant impacts that were not previously addressed. No LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures from the 2003 LRDP EIR regarding geology, soils, and seismicity impacts are relevant to the proposed project.
7.7 HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

7.7.1 Background

Section 4.7 of the 2003 LRDP EIR addresses the hazards and hazardous materials effects of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP. The following discussion summarizes information presented in the ‘Setting’ subsection of Section 4.7 of the 2003 LRDP EIR.

Campus

A variety of hazardous materials are used on campus during the course of daily operations. Hazardous chemicals used on campus include: chemical solvents, reagents, and aromatic hydrocarbons that are used in campus laboratories; pesticides, fungicides, and herbicides used by agricultural programs and in landscape maintenance; relatively small amounts of solvents, paints, and acids used by fine arts programs; gasoline and diesel fuels, oils and lubricants, antifreeze, cleaning solvents and corrosives, paints and paint thinners, and freon refrigerants used in vehicle and building maintenance. In addition, radioactive materials, biohazardous materials, and laboratory animals are used in teaching and research activities. The use of hazardous materials on campus generates hazardous byproducts that must eventually be handled and disposed of as hazardous wastes.

Generation, transportation, and disposal of hazardous wastes are regulated by various agencies. The lead federal regulatory agency is the Environmental Protection Agency. The State Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has primary state regulatory responsibility but can delegate enforcement authority to local jurisdictions that enter into agreements with the state agency, as it did with Yolo County Department of Environmental Health (YCDEH) under the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) program.

The campus’ Office of Environmental Health and Safety (EH&S) coordinates most local, state, and federal regulatory compliance functions related to the campus’ health, safety, and environmental issues. EH&S performs safety education and training, regulatory interpretation and applicability, approval of potentially hazardous procedures, resolution of safety problems, surveillance, and monitoring. In addition, EH&S provides guidance for several campus safety programs, including: the Chemical Inventory System, which tracks inventory and use of hazardous materials on campus; the CUPA Self-Audit Program, which complies with the terms of an agreement with the YCDEH; development of laboratory-specific Chemical Hygiene Plans; the Radiation and X-Ray Safety Programs; and the Biological Safety Administrative Advisory Committee. EH&S is also a working partner in such campus administrative advisory groups as the Chemical Safety Committee, the Radiation Safety Committees, the Animal Use and Care Committee, and the Biological Safety Committee. External administrative and benchmarking reviews of the EH&S programs are conducted periodically to identify means of further improving the programs. Benchmarking performed by the Campus Safety, Health, and Environmental Management Association (CSHEMA) in 2000 honored the UC Davis EH&S with a “Unique or Innovative Program Award” for its daily on-call program.

Project Site

The campus completed a Phase I Preliminary Site Assessment Due Diligence Report for past use of hazardous materials on the project site (Pfohl 2006). The assessment found no significant environmental concerns, and no additional assessment is recommended. Based on the age of the existing building, and therefore the likelihood of finding asbestos-containing materials, the report recommends that the Campus Asbestos Operations and Maintenance program be followed when remodeling, construction, and/or demolition activities take place at King Hall.
2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance

The 2003 LRDP EIR considers a hazards and hazardous materials impact significant if growth under the 2003 LRDP would:

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.
- 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.
- Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school.
- Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- For a project within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.
- Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Additional standards from the CEQA Guidelines' Environmental Checklist ("f" and "h" in the checklist below) were found not applicable to campus growth under the 2003 LRDP.

2003 LRDP EIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 related to hazards and hazardous materials are evaluated in Section 4.7 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. As analyzed in Section 4 of this Initial Study, the proposed project is within the scope of analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR. Potentially significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are relevant to the proposed project are presented below with their corresponding levels of significance before and after application of mitigation measures identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR. In addition, LRDP Impacts 4.7-1, 4.7-2, 4.7-8, 4.7-9, 4.7-12, and 4.7-13, presented below, are considered less than significant prior to mitigation, but the 2003 LRDP EIR identified mitigation to further reduce the significance of these impacts. Less than significant impacts without mitigation measures are not presented here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2003 LRDP EIR Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.7-1 Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase routine hazardous chemical use on campus by UC Davis laboratories and departments and in maintenance and support operations, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7-2 Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could increase routine generation of hazardous wastes on campus by UC Davis laboratories and departments and from maintenance and support operations, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7-8 Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase the routine transport of hazardous materials to and from campus, which would not significantly</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2003 LRDP EIR Impacts

**HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Prior to Mitigation</th>
<th>After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>increase hazards to the public or the environment.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not 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.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction activities on campus under the 2003 LRDP would not expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated soil or groundwater.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition or renovation of buildings under the 2003 LRDP would not expose construction workers or campus occupants to contaminated building materials.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus development under the 2003 LRDP could physically interfere with the campus’ Emergency Operations Plan.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of Significance: LS=Less than Significant, S=Significant, PS=Potentially Significant, SU=Significant and Unavoidable

Mitigation measures in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are applicable to the proposed project are presented below. Since these mitigation measures are already being carried out as part of implementation of the 2003 LRDP, they will not be readopted in this Initial Study or Negative Declaration. The benefits of these mitigation measures will be achieved independently of considering them as specific mitigation measures of this project. Nothing in this Initial Study in any way alters the obligations of the campus to implement 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures.

### 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

**HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

| 4.7-1 | The campus shall continue to implement the same (or equivalent) safety plans, programs, practices, and procedures related to the use, storage, and disposal of hazardous chemical materials during the 2003 LRDP planning horizon, including, but not necessarily limited to, the Business Plan, Hazardous Materials Communication Program, Chemical Inventory System, CUPA Self-Audit program, Injury and Illness Prevention Program, Chemical Hygiene Plans, Medical Surveillance Program, Chemical Safety Advisory Committee, Chemical Carcinogen Safety Program, and EH&S audits and safety training. These programs may be replaced by other programs that incorporate similar health and safety measures. |
| 4.7-2(a) | Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.7-1. |
| 4.7-2(b) | The campus shall continue to implement the same (or equivalent) hazardous waste management programs during the 2003 LRDP planning horizon, including, but not necessarily limited to, hazardous waste storage and handling procedures, the waste minimization program, the pretreatment program, and the Waste Exclusion Program. These programs may be subject to modification as more stringent standards are developed or if the programs become obsolete through replacement by other programs that incorporate similar health and safety protection measures. |
| 4.7-8 | The campus shall continue to require that packaging of chemicals to be transported on public roads conform with all legal requirements. |
| 4.7-9 | Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.7-1 through 4.7-8. |
| 4.7-12 | The campus shall perform due diligence assessments of all sites where ground-disturbing construction is proposed. |
| 4.7-13 | The campus shall survey buildings for potential contamination before any demolition or renovation work is performed. |
| 4.7-17 | To the extent feasible, the campus shall maintain at least one unobstructed lane in both directions on campus roadways. At any time only a single lane is available due to construction-related road closures, the campus shall provide a temporary traffic signal, signal carriers (i.e., flagpersons), or other appropriate traffic controls. |
2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

to allow travel in both directions. If construction activities require the complete closure of a roadway, the campus shall provide appropriate signage indicating alternative routes. To ensure adequate access for emergency vehicles when construction projects would result in temporary lane or roadway closures, the campus shall inform emergency services, including the UC Davis Police and Fire Departments, and American Medical Response, of the closures and alternative travel routes.

7.7.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAZARDS &amp; HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Impact for which 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) The project would use standard construction materials that could include hazardous substances such as gasoline, cements, sealants, paints and solvents. Routine operation and maintenance of the equipment is not anticipated to require use of products containing hazardous materials other than cleaners or other products for routine maintenance. These products currently are in use on campus, and the amounts associated with use at the project sites would be similar to or less than existing operations and maintenance activities. The project would install a new transformer.
which would be filled with mineral oil, as PCBs are no longer used in transformers. The impact would be less than significant.

Hazardous Chemicals

The 2003 LRDP EIR found that implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase routine hazardous chemical use (Impact 4.7-1), routine generation of hazardous chemical wastes (Impact 4.7-2), and routine hazardous materials transport to and from the campus (Impact 4.7-8) by UC Davis laboratories, departments, and maintenance/support operations, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment. The campus achieves a high level of compliance with regulatory standards and campus policies relevant to use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials, as discussed further in the ‘Setting’ subsection to Section 4.7 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. Hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities currently have available capacity to accept and safely manage UC Davis chemical waste. The campus will continue to implement relevant safety programs and meet relevant standards regarding hazardous materials use, transport, and waste management for the proposed project, as well as for other projects proposed under the 2003 LRDP. Therefore, these project-level impacts would be less than significant. To ensure that safety policies continue to be implemented and to further reduce the significance of these impacts, LRDP Mitigations 4.7-1, 4.7-2(a-b), and 4.7-8 are included as part of the proposed project.

Given the campus’ and local jurisdiction’s existing policies and compliance with state and federal regulations, the 2003 LRDP EIR found that cumulative impacts related to the use and transport of hazardous materials and the generation of hazardous waste are less than significant.

b) The 2003 LRDP EIR found that implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not 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 (Impact 4.7-9). Compliance with all applicable federal and state laws, as well as campus programs, practices, and procedures related to the transportation, storage, and use of hazardous materials, would continue for the proposed project as well as other projects proposed under the 2003 LRDP, minimizing the potential for an accidental release of hazardous materials and providing for prompt and effective cleanup if an accidental release occurs. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant. To ensure continued compliance with relevant laws and campus policies and to further reduce this less-than-significant impact, the LRDP Mitigation 4.7-9 is included as part of the project.

c) Existing schools within ¼ mile of campus include Martin Luther King High School on B Street in downtown Davis; Emerson Junior High School on Calaveras Avenue; Rivendell Nursery School; Parkside Children’s House (formerly Davis Montessori School); Redbud Montessori School north of the west campus; the Grace Valley Christian Academy on County Road 98; and the Fairfield Elementary School on Russell Boulevard at County Road 96. There are no proposed new Davis Joint Unified School District (DJUSD) school sites within ¼ mile of the campus boundaries. The future west campus neighborhood is planned to include DJUSD elementary and high school facilities on the campus. Childcare centers are currently located on the campus. On site, the School of Law has a small parent co-operative nursery for the infants of law school students; up to six infants are accommodated in the nursery while their parents attend classes (King Hall 2006).

Although hazardous materials associated with construction and maintenance of the proposed project could be handled within ¼ mile of existing and proposed schools and childcare centers, these materials would not be handled in quantities sufficient to pose a risk to occupants of the schools or to members of the campus and surrounding community. Therefore, the impact to those attending existing or proposed schools would be less than significant.
d) The Laboratory for Energy Related Research/South Campus Disposal site is the only campus site that is listed as a hazardous materials site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The proposed project would not disturb this site.

The 2003 LRDP EIR found that construction activities under the 2003 LRDP would not expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated soil or groundwater (Impact 4.7-12) and that demolition or renovation of buildings under the 2003 LRDP would not expose construction workers or campus occupants to contaminated building materials (Impact 4.7-13). Campus policy requires that due diligence surveys be performed for all proposed project sites as part of the project planning process. The campus completed a Phase I Preliminary Site Assessment Due Diligence Report for the project site (Pfohl 2006). The assessment found no significant environmental concerns, and no additional assessment is recommended. Based on the age of the existing building, and therefore the likelihood of finding asbestos-containing materials, the report recommends that the Campus Asbestos Operations and Maintenance program be followed when remodeling, construction, and/or demolition activities take place at King Hall. Federal and state regulations require that workers who may be exposed to contaminants during the course of their jobs know of the presence of contamination and be properly trained. In addition, these regulations require that appropriate engineering and administrative controls and protective equipment be provided to reduce exposure to safe levels. Current campus due diligence policy and Cal/OSHA regulations minimize the exposure of construction workers to contaminants. In addition, if contaminants are identified on project sites, the campus would coordinate site remediation. Therefore, the impacts would be less than significant. To ensure that due diligence surveys are performed and to further reduce this less-than-significant impact, LRDP Mitigations 4.7-12 and 4.7-13 have been implemented as part of the proposed project.

e) The project site is approximately two miles from University Airport. The 2003 LRDP EIR found that development of certain projects on the west campus under the 2003 LRDP could result in safety hazards associated with aircraft. However, the proposed project is not one of these projects and would not conflict with airport operations. Therefore, no impact would occur.

f) The University Airport is a public use airport, not a private airstrip. No other airport facilities are within the immediate vicinity of the campus. No impact would occur. Refer to item e) above for a discussion of potential safety hazards associated with the University airport, a local public use airport.

g) The 2003 LRDP EIR found that implementation of the 2003 LRDP could interfere with the campus' Emergency Operations Plan through construction-related road closures (Impact 4.7-17). The proposed project likely would require occasional road closures along Mrak Hall Drive for deliveries of construction materials or equipment. The proposed chilled water and steam utility line upgrades likely would require road closures on California Avenue during construction of the lines. Under current campus procedures, if there are changes in traffic patterns resulting from construction lane or roadway closures, the UC Davis Office of Architects and Engineers initiates notification of emergency services, including the UC Davis Fire Department and Police Department, and American Medical Response, which provides regional ambulance services to the campus. In addition, to ensure that the proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with emergency response and evacuation efforts, LRDP Mitigation 4.7-17, which requires the campus to keep at least one lane open in both directions to the extent feasible, will be included as part of the proposed project. No other potential impacts associated with interference of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would occur.

h) Areas along Putah Creek are the only areas on campus that could be susceptible to wildland fires. Urbanization will not occur in close proximity to these areas under the 2003 LRDP because land along Putah Creek is designated for Open Space and Teaching and Research Fields, and land
adjacent to these open areas is designated primarily for Teaching and Research Fields and low density development. The project site is surrounded by development and located at a distance from Putah Creek. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**Summary**

Mitigation measures 4.7-1, 4.7-2(a-b), 4.7-8, 4.7-9, 4.7-12, 4.7-13, and 4.7-17 from the 2003 LRDP EIR are relevant to the proposed project and reduce the significance of hazards and hazardous materials impacts to the extent feasible. The proposed project would not exceed the levels of significance of hazards and hazardous materials impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts that were not previously addressed.
7.8 Hydrology & Water Quality

7.8.1 Background

Section 4.8 of the 2003 LRDP EIR addresses the hydrology and water quality effects of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP. The following discussion summarizes information presented in the ‘Setting’ subsection of Section 4.8 of the 2003 LRDP EIR.

Campus

Surface Water Resources

The UC Davis campus is located in the Lower Sacramento watershed. Putah Creek, the principal waterway in the Davis area, originates from springs in the Mayacamas Mountains northwest of the campus, flows into Lake Berryessa, through Winters, along the southern boundary of Russell Ranch, along the southern boundary of UC Davis’ west and south campuses, and eventually into the Yolo Bypass, an overflow channel for the Sacramento River. The North Fork Cutoff and the Arboretum Waterway on campus follow the historic channel of Putah Creek, but currently have no natural flow. The North Fork Cutoff is a typically dry stream channel on the west campus that is currently occupied by sheep and cattle programs in the Department of Animal Science. The Arboretum Waterway serves as the storm water detention basin for the central campus.

UC Davis is a member of the Solano Project, and currently has rights to purchase 4,000 acre-feet of Putah Creek water from Lake Berryessa per year, although reductions in deliveries can occur during drought conditions. The water is delivered to the southwest corner of the campus via an underground pipeline. UC Davis also has rights to surface water from Putah and Cache Creeks. The campus has not used this water in the recent past, but the tenant farmer at Russell Ranch uses approximately 3,750 acre-feet of water per year from Putah and Cache Creeks (via Willow Canal) for irrigation of commercial crops.

The quantity and quality of flows in Putah Creek are highly variable and depend on releases from Lake Berryessa, precipitation, storm water runoff, and treated effluent discharge. The campus’ tertiary level Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) is the largest discharger of treated effluent to Putah Creek. The plant is regulated under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit issued by the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB).

Groundwater Resources

The campus is underlain by sand and gravel alluvial deposits that include deep and shallow/intermediate depth aquifers. Deep gravel and sand aquifers underlie the campus between 600 to 1,500 feet below ground surface and supply the campus domestic/fire system. Historic annual domestic water use on campus over the past three decades has ranged from less than 600 million gallons per year (mgy) during drought conditions to nearly 900 mgy (UC Davis 1997). Despite the campus’ significant growth in recent decades, the campus’ deep aquifer demands have not significantly increased since the late 1960s, a trend that reflects the success of the campus’ water conservation efforts.

Shallow/intermediate depth sand and gravel aquifers underlie the campus at depths from 150 to 800 feet below ground surface and supply the campus utility water system, main campus agricultural water needs, and campus and tenant farmer irrigation needs at Russell Ranch. Over the past ten years, an average of approximately 2,657 acre-feet per year of shallow/intermediate aquifer water was used.
for agricultural purposes on campus, including approximately 1,813 acre-feet on the main campus and approximately 844 acre-feet at Russell Ranch (UC Davis Agricultural Services 2003, UC Davis ORMP 2003c). Water levels in the shallow/intermediate aquifer vary seasonally and strongly correlate to precipitation. A generally upward recharge trend over the period from 1957 to 2002 indicates that there has not been long-term overdraft of the shallow/intermediate depth aquifers.

Regional groundwater quality is generally characterized as having high mineral content. Calcium, magnesium, and sulfates have been identified as the dominant problematic constituents.

**Flooding & Drainage**

On campus, the South Fork of Putah Creek, the North Fork Cutoff, and the Arboretum Waterway channels are designated as FEMA 100-year floodplain areas. In addition, a portion of Russell Ranch along County Road 31 and a portion of the west campus along County Road 98 are also subject to flooding during a 100-year storm event.

The central campus drainage system intercepts and collects runoff and transports this water to the Arboretum Waterway. During large storm events, water rises in the Arboretum Waterway, overtops the weir at the west end of the waterway, and flows into the pump pond located north of the weir. From the pump pond, water is pumped through an underground storm drain to the South Fork of Putah Creek. The peak discharge from the Arboretum Waterway to Putah Creek measured since December 1999 was 65 cubic feet per second (cfs). The majority of land in the west and south campuses and at Russell Ranch is used as teaching and research fields and is not drained by a storm drainage system. Irrigation practices on campus teaching and research fields typically do not generate surface runoff. However, large storm events may result in shallow overland flows. In addition, developed areas on the west and south campuses include storm water conveyance systems that drain to Putah Creek.

To protect the quality of storm water on campus that ultimately drains to Putah Creek, UC Davis construction and industrial activities are subject to the NPDES storm water requirements. Routine maintenance and minor construction activities on campus are subject to the campus' Phase II Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP).

**Project Site**

The project site is adjacent to the Arboretum Waterway. The existing building on the project site is connected to the campus storm water drainage system and the utility and domestic water systems. There are two existing storm drains at the southern edge of the site, which discharge to the Arboretum Waterway and from there ultimately to the south fork of Putah Creek. The portion of the site for which a proposed building addition is planned is currently landscaped, and storm water runoff drains to the Arboretum Waterway via sheet flow, or through drainage to roadway storm water collection gutters.

**7.8.2 2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance**

The 2003 LRDP EIR considers a hydrology and water quality impact significant if growth under the 2003 LRDP would:

- Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
- 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.
• 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 site or off site.

• 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 site or off site.

• Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

• Otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

• Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows.

• Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding.

Additional standards from the CEQA Guidelines' Environmental Checklist ("g" and "j" in the checklist below) were found not applicable to campus growth under the 2003 LRDP.

### 7.8.3 2003 LRDP EIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on hydrology and water quality are evaluated in Section 4.8 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. As analyzed in Section 4 of this Initial Study, the proposed project is within the scope of analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR. Significant and potentially significant hydrology and water quality impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are relevant to the proposed project are presented below with their corresponding levels of significance before and after application of mitigation measures identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR. In addition, Impact 4.8-1, presented below, is considered less than significant prior to mitigation, but mitigation measures were identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR to further reduce the significance of this impact. Other less than significant impacts that do not include mitigation measures are not presented here. Mitigation measures are included to reduce the magnitude of project-level impacts 4.8-5 and 4.8-6 and cumulative impacts 4.8-13 and 4.8-14, but these impacts are identified as significant and unavoidable because they cannot be fully mitigated. Mitigation is also relevant to reduce the magnitude of cumulative impact 4.8-10, but this impact is identified as significant and unavoidable because mitigation falls within other jurisdictions to enforce and monitor and therefore cannot be guaranteed by the University of California.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2003 LRDP EIR Impacts</th>
<th>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER QUALITY</th>
<th>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.8-1</td>
<td>Campus construction activities associated with implementation of the 2003 LRDP would not contribute substantial loads of sediment or other pollutants in storm water runoff that could degrade receiving water quality.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8-2</td>
<td>Development under the 2003 LRDP would increase impervious surface on the campus and could alter drainage patterns, thereby increasing runoff and loads of pollutants in storm water, which could affect water quality.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8-3</td>
<td>Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could alter drainage patterns in the project area and increase impervious surfaces, which could exceed the capacity of storm water drainage systems and result in localized flooding and contribution to offsite flooding.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8-4</td>
<td>Campus growth under the 2003 LRDP would increase discharge of treated effluent from the campus wastewater treatment plant into the South Fork of</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2003 LRDP EIR Impacts

**HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Putah Creek, which could exceed waste discharge requirements and degrade receiving water quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8-5 Campus growth under the 2003 LRDP would increase the amount of water extracted from the deep aquifer and would increase impervious surfaces. This could result in a net deficit in the deep aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table but would not interfere substantially with recharge of the deep aquifer.</td>
<td>S SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8-6 Campus growth under the 2003 LRDP could increase the amount of water extracted from the shallow/intermediate aquifer and would increase impervious surfaces. Extraction from the shallow/intermediate aquifer could deplete groundwater levels and could contribute to local subsidence, and increased impervious coverage could interfere substantially with recharge. This could result in a net deficit in the intermediate aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table.</td>
<td>SU SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8-10 Development under the 2003 LRDP, in conjunction with construction activities, increased impervious surfaces, and alterations to drainage patterns associated with other development in the region that would increase impervious surface coverage in the watershed, could increase storm water runoff, and could provide substantial sources of polluted runoff, which could affect receiving water quality.</td>
<td>S SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8-11 Implementation of the 2003 LRDP in combination with regional development could alter drainage patterns and increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, which could exceed the capacity of storm water drainage systems and result in flooding within the Putah Creek watershed.</td>
<td>PS LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8-12 Growth under the 2003 LRDP and other development in the region would increase discharge of treated effluent to the Putah Creek watershed, which could degrade receiving water quality.</td>
<td>PS LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8-13 Growth under the 2003 LRDP and other development in the region would increase the amount of water extracted from the deep aquifer and increase impervious surfaces. This could result in a net deficit in the deep aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table but would not interfere substantially with recharge of the deep aquifer.</td>
<td>S SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8-14 Growth under the 2003 LRDP and other development in the region would increase the amount of water extracted from shallow/intermediate aquifers and increase impervious surfaces. This could contribute to local subsidence, substantially deplete groundwater supplies, and could interfere substantially with recharge of the shallow/intermediate depth aquifer, resulting in a net deficit in the shallow/intermediate aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table.</td>
<td>S SU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of Significance: LS=Less than Significant, S=Significant, PS=Potentially Significant, SU=Significant and Unavoidable

Mitigation measures in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are applicable to the proposed project are presented below. Since these mitigation measures are already being carried out as part of implementation of the 2003 LRDP, they will not be readopted in this Initial Study or Negative Declaration. The benefits of these mitigation measures will be achieved independently of considering them as specific mitigation measures of this project. Nothing in this Initial Study in any way alters the obligations of the campus to implement 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures.

### 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

**HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY**
4.8-1 The campus shall continue to comply with the NPDES state-wide General Permit for Discharge of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity by implementing control measures and BMPs required by project-specific SWPPPs and with the Phase II SWMP to eliminate or reduce non-storm and storm water discharges to receiving waters.

4.8-2 The campus shall comply with the measures in the Phase II SWMP to ensure that project design includes a combination of BMPs, or equally effective measures as they become available in the future, to minimize the contribution of pollutants to receiving waters.

4.8-3(a) Prior to approval of specific projects under the 2003 LRDP, the campus shall perform a drainage study to evaluate each specific development to determine whether project runoff would exceed the capacity of the existing storm drainage system, cause ponding to worsen, and/or increase the potential for property damage from flooding.

4.8-3(b) If it is determined that existing drainage capacity would be exceeded, ponding could worsen, and/or risk of property damage from flooding could increase, the campus shall design and implement necessary and feasible improvements. Such improvements could include, but would not be limited to, the following:

   (i) The expansion or modification of the existing storm drainage system.

   (ii) Single-project detention or retention basins incorporated into project design with features including but not limited to: small onsite detention or retention basins; rooftop ponding; temporary flooding of parking areas, streets and gutters; landscaping designed to temporarily retain water; and gravel beds designed to collect and retain runoff.

   (iii) Multi-project storm water detention or retention basins.

4.8-4(a) The campus shall continue to monitor and modify its pretreatment program, WWTP operation, and/or treatment processes as necessary to comply with WDRs.

4.8-4(b) The campus shall implement a monitoring program specifically targeted at the following constituents: copper, cyanide, iron and nitrate + nitrite, and make appropriate modifications as necessary to the campus pretreatment program to avoid exceedance of permit limits for these constituents.

4.8-5(a) The campus shall continue to implement water conservation strategies to reduce demand for water from the deep aquifer. Domestic water conservation strategies shall include the following or equivalent measures:

   (i) Install water efficient shower heads and low-flow toilets that meet or exceed building code conservation requirements in all new campus buildings, and where feasible, retrofit existing buildings with these water efficient devices.

   (ii) Continue the leak detection and repair program.

   (iii) Continue converting existing single-pass cooling systems to cooling tower systems.

   (iv) Use water-conservative landscaping on the west and south campuses where domestic water is used for irrigation.

   (v) Replace domestic water irrigation systems on the west and south campuses with an alternate water source (shallow/intermediate or reclaimed water), where feasible.

   (vi) Install water meters at the proposed neighborhood to encourage residential water conservation.

   (vii) Identify and implement additional feasible water conservation strategies and programs including a water awareness program focused on water conservation.

4.8-5(b) The campus shall continue hydrogeologic monitoring and evaluation efforts to determine the long-term production and quality trends of the deep aquifer.

4.8-5(c) To the extent feasible, new water supply wells in the deep aquifer should be located on the west campus in sands and gravels that are not used by or available to the City of Davis for deep water extraction.

4.8-5(d) If continued hydrogeologic monitoring and evaluation efforts identify constraints in the deep aquifer's ability to provide for the campus' long-term water needs, the campus will treat shallow/intermediate aquifer and/or surface water from the Solano Project to serve domestic water demand.

4.8-6(a) The campus shall continue to implement water conservation strategies to reduce demand for water from the intermediate aquifer. Utility water conservation strategies shall include the following or equivalent measures:
(i) Landscape, where appropriate, with native, drought resistant plants and use lawns only where needed for pedestrian traffic, activity areas, and recreation.
(ii) Install efficient irrigation systems including centrally controlled automatic irrigation systems and low-flow spray systems.
(iii) Apply heavy applications of mulch to landscaped areas to reduce evaporation
(iv) Use treated wastewater for landscape irrigation where feasible.

4.8-6(b) The campus shall continue to monitor shallow/intermediate aquifer water elevations at existing campus wells to ascertain whether there is any long-term decline in water levels.

4.8-6(c) The campus shall continue to participate in regional subsidence monitoring, including by installing an extensometer, to determine the vertical location of local subsidence.

4.8-6(d) If shallow/intermediate aquifer monitoring or subsidence monitoring indicate that campus water use from the intermediate aquifer is contributing to a net deficit in aquifer volume and/or significant subsidence, the campus will reduce use of water from the aquifer by using surface water and/or treated wastewater effluent to irrigate campus recreation fields.

4.8-6(e) The campus shall incorporate the following or equally effective measures into project designs under the 2003 LRDP where feasible, to increase percolation and infiltration of precipitation into the underlying shallow/intermediate aquifers:
(i) Minimize paved surfaces.
(ii) Use grassy swales, infiltration trenches, or grass filter strips to intercept storm water runoff.
(iii) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.8-3(b), which specifies construction of detention and infiltration facilities in those areas that do not discharge storm water to the Arboretum.

4.8-10(a) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.8-1 and 4.8-2.

4.8-10(b) Jurisdictions within the Putah Creek watershed should comply with Phase II NPDES Municipal Storm Water Permit requirements for small municipalities in order to minimize the contribution of sediment and other pollutants associated with development in the region.

4.8-10(c) Comprehensive SWPPPs and monitoring programs should be implemented by all storm water dischargers associated with specified industrial and construction activities, in compliance with the state's General Permits. Such plans shall include BMPs or equally effective measures.

4.8-11 The campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation 4.8-3(a-c) in order to prevent flooding on campus.

4.8-12 The campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation 4.8-4(a) and (b) to minimize the potential for degradation of receiving water quality.

4.8-13(a) Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.8-5(a-d).

4.8-13(b) The City of Davis is expected to implement measures to reduce the amount of water withdrawn from the deep aquifer consistent with policies adopted in its General Plan.
- Give priority to demand reduction and conservation over additional water resource development (Policy WATER 1.1)
- Require water conserving landscaping (Policy WATER 1.2)
- Provide for the current and long-range water needs of the Davis Planning Area, and for protection of the quality and quantity of groundwater resources (Policy WATER 2.1)
- Manage groundwater resources so as to preserve both quantity and quality (Policy WATER 2.2)
- Research, monitor and participate in issues in Yolo County and the area of origin of the City’s groundwater that affect the quality and quantity of water (Policy WATER 4.1)

4.8-14(a) The campus should implement LRDP Mitigation 4.8-6(a-c) to minimize its withdrawal from the shallow/intermediate aquifer and maximize the potential for infiltration.
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4.8-14(b) Consistent with current water planning policies, the City of Davis is expected to implement measures to reduce impervious surfaces and reduce the amount of water withdrawn from the shallow/intermediate aquifer, consistent with, but not limited to, the water policies listed in LRDP Mitigation 4.8-13(h).

### 7.8.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER QUALITY</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact for which 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<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>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</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>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</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>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a,f) Construction
The 2003 LRDP EIR found that construction on campus under the 2003 LRDP would not contribute substantial loads of sediment or other pollutants to storm water runoff (Impact 4.8-1). Construction on campus is covered under the NPDES state-wide General Permit for Discharge of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity. As part of this permit, campus construction projects managed by outside contractors and/or disturbing over one acre (including the proposed project) must implement Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs), which specify Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce the contribution of sediments, spilled and leaked liquids from construction equipment, and other construction-related pollutants to storm water runoff. All routine maintenance activities and any construction projects disturbing less than one acre that are not managed by outside contractors are covered under the campus' Phase II Municipal Storm Water Management Plan, which requires BMPs to reduce contribution of pollutants to storm water runoff. Because the UC Davis campus is required to comply with the NPDES state-wide permit and Phase II requirements, the water quality effects associated with construction activities on campus are considered to be less than significant. In addition, LRDP Mitigation 4.8-1, included as part of the project, requires the campus to implement BMPs to reduce construction-related water quality impacts.

**Operation**

Sanitary sewer effluent generated by the proposed project would be treated at the campus wastewater treatment plant (WWTP). The project would not increase the campus population; however, the building addition would add restrooms to the building, and could result in a slight increase in effluent. The 2003 LRDP EIR found that campus growth under the 2003 LRDP would increase discharge of treated effluent from the campus WWTP into the South Fork of Putah Creek, which could exceed waste discharge requirements and degrade receiving water quality (Impact 4.8-4). With current and future discharge control programs and possible operational changes, the increased discharge from the WWTP associated with the proposed project as well as other projects under the 2003 LRDP is expected to comply with NPDES regulations, and therefore will not cause degradation of receiving water quality. The campus will continue to monitor effluent discharge in compliance with the applicable WDRs for the WWTP, and if effluent limits are exceeded, the campus will modify its pretreatment program and WWTP operation as appropriate. These practices are further confirmed in LRDP Mitigation 4.8-4(a), which is included as part of the project. In compliance with LRDP Mitigation 4.8-4(b), also relevant to part of the project, the campus will target monitoring and pretreatment for the contaminants specifically identified as of potential concern by the CVRWQCB. These measures would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

The 2003 LRDP EIR found that growth under the 2003 LRDP and other development in the region would increase the cumulative discharge of treated effluent to the Putah Creek watershed, which could degrade receiving water quality (Impact 4.8-12). However, UC Davis is currently the largest discharger of treated effluent to Putah Creek, and no other major dischargers are expected in the future. LRDP Mitigation 4.8-12, included as part of the project, requires implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.8-4(a-b), discussed above, which would reduce the impact of increased effluent discharge from the campus WWTP to Putah Creek to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, with implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.8-12, which is included in the proposed project, the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

**b) Deep Aquifer**

The proposed project would have an estimated demand of 120 gpm (current demand is 110 gpm). Although the project would not increase the campus population, the proposed building addition would add restrooms, and the proposed renovation would retrofit the existing building with a full-building fire sprinkler fire system. The 2003 LRDP EIR found that campus growth under the
2003 LRDP would increase the amount of water extracted from the deep aquifer and would increase impervious surfaces, which could result in a net deficit in the deep aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table but would not interfere substantially with recharge of the deep aquifer (Impact 4.8-5). The deep aquifer is confined with limited lateral and vertical recharge and is overlain by thick clay layers that are relatively impermeable. Because of these characteristics, increased impervious surfaces associated with development under the 2003 LRDP will not significantly affect the recharge capacity of the deep aquifer. The 2001 demand for water from the deep aquifer was approximately 2,671 acre-feet. The annual demand for deep aquifer water under the 2003 LRDP, including demand associated with the proposed project, is expected to increase to approximately 5,301 acre-feet through 2015-16 (UC Davis ORMP 2003c). LRDP Mitigation 4.8-5(a-c), included as part of the project, would require continued water conservation efforts, efforts to determine the ability of the deep aquifer to provide for the campus’ long-term water needs, and efforts to minimize withdrawals by UC Davis and the City of Davis from the same deep aquifers. If monitoring identifies that the aquifer is unable to meet the campus' long-term needs, consistent with LRDP Mitigation 4.8-5(d), the campus would treat intermediate aquifer water and/or surface water to serve domestic water needs. Regardless of these mitigation measures, if UC Davis' future demand for water from the deep aquifer increases, groundwater levels in the deep aquifer could lower, contributing to a net deficit in the overall groundwater budget. The effects of increased demand on the volume of the deep aquifer are currently not well understood (although consistent with LRDP Mitigation 4.8-5(b), the campus will continue to study these effects). Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable. This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information has become available since certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR that would alter this previous analysis.

The 2003 LRDP EIR found that growth under the 2003 LRDP and other development in the region would cumulatively increase the amount of water extracted from the deep aquifer and would increase impervious surfaces, which could result in a net deficit in the deep aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table, but would not interfere substantially with recharge of the deep aquifer (Impact 4.8-13). The long-term reliability of the deep aquifer could be at risk if both UC Davis and the City of Davis rely on the aquifer to meet their future needs. In compliance with LRDP Mitigation 4.8-13(a), included in the proposed project, the campus would take the following actions: minimize withdrawals from those aquifers shared with the City of Davis by locating new wells on the west campus when feasible; monitor the deep aquifer; conserve water; and manage water supplies efficiently. LRDP Mitigation 4.8-13(b) recognizes the City of Davis General Plan’s objectives regarding reduction of water extraction from the deep aquifer. However, regardless of mitigation, because the effects of increased demand on the volume of the deep aquifer are currently not well understood, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable. This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information has become available since certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR that would alter this previous analysis.

**Shallow/Intermediate Aquifer**

The proposed project would develop approximately an additional one-half acre with impervious surfaces. The project would impose minimal additional demand on the utility water system. The 2003 LRDP EIR found that the campus' extraction from shallow/intermediate aquifers could deplete groundwater levels and could contribute to local subsidence. In addition, increased impervious coverage could interfere with recharge of the shallow/intermediate aquifers. This
could result in a net deficit in the intermediate aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table (Impact 4.8-6).

The 2001 baseline annual campus demand (including irrigation demand associated with the tenant farmer at Russell Ranch) for water from the shallow/intermediate aquifers was approximately 3,827 acre-feet. Under the 2003 LRDP, due to conversion of teaching and research fields to other uses with reduced irrigation requirements, overall annual demand for water from the shallow/intermediate aquifers is anticipated to decrease to approximately 3,362 acre-feet through 2015-16 (UC Davis ORMP 2003c). However, these projections do not address the potential identified in LRDP Mitigation 4.8-5(d) for intermediate aquifer water to be used to serve the campus’ domestic water needs. If this mitigation is implemented, demand for water from the intermediate aquifer could increase. In addition, recent monitoring efforts indicate subsidence in the campus vicinity. Due to the short history of subsidence monitoring in the area, the extent and cause of this subsidence is currently unknown; however, extraction from the shallow/intermediate aquifer could be a contributing factor. Additionally, development under the 2003 LRDP, including the proposed project, would increase the amount of impervious surfaces on campus. However, because the soils underlying the campus generally have low permeability and would provide limited recharge, new impervious surfaces are not likely to significantly reduce the amount and rate of groundwater recharge. Most recharge in the area is associated with streams and waterways, which would not be affected by the project.

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-6(a-c), included as part of the proposed project, would require continued utility water conservation efforts, monitoring of the intermediate aquifer, and subsidence monitoring efforts. Furthermore, implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.8-6(e), included in the proposed project, would encourage project designs on campus that increase percolation and infiltration to the shallow/intermediate aquifer. The project proposes some design measures, described below in item c) to slow down runoff and thereby increase percolation and infiltration on the site, to the extent possible. If the monitoring efforts required by LRDP Mitigation 4.8-6(b) or (c) identify that campus intermediate aquifer use is contributing to a net deficit in aquifer volume or significant subsidence, LRDP Mitigation 4.8-6(d) would be implemented to reduce campus utility water use by requiring use of Solano Project surface water and/or tertiary treated wastewater effluent from the campus WWTP for irrigation of campus recreation fields. Regardless of mitigation, the combination of effects from continued demand for water from the shallow/intermediate aquifer, local subsidence trends, and increased coverage could potentially result in a significant impact on intermediate aquifer groundwater levels. Therefore, Impact 4.8-6 is considered significant and unavoidable. This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information has become available since certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR that would alter this previous analysis.

The 2003 LRDP EIR found that growth under the 2003 LRDP and other development in the region would cumulatively increase the amount of water extracted from shallow/intermediate aquifers and would increase impervious surfaces. This could contribute to local subsidence, substantially deplete groundwater supplies, and could interfere substantially with recharge of the shallow/intermediate depth aquifer, resulting in a net deficit in the shallow/intermediate aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table (Impact 4.8-14). Although campus extraction of water from the shallow/intermediate aquifers is anticipated to continue to decrease through 2015-16, a potential increase in extraction in the Davis area could cause well levels to decrease. In addition, extraction from these aquifers could be causing subsidence that has been observed in the area, and increases in impervious surfaces could impede the amount of groundwater recharge. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.8-13(a) and (b) would reduce the campus and City extractions from the shallow/intermediate aquifers, would reduce the amount of
new impervious surfaces in the area, and would continue groundwater level and subsidence monitoring efforts. Regardless of mitigation, the combination of effects from continued local demand for water from the shallow/intermediate aquifers, local subsidence trends, and increased coverage could result in a significant and unavoidable impact on the aquifers. This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information has become available since certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR that would alter this previous analysis.

c) The proposed project would develop approximately an additional one-half acre with impervious surfaces, including a building, paved walkways, and entry steps. The site is adjacent to the Arboretum Waterway, and drains into the Waterway. Existing drain inlets at the northeast and southeast corners of the existing building would be relocated as a result of the proposed addition. The courtyard drainage system would require reconfiguration with the renovation. Rainwater planters and a bioswale are proposed to handle all new runoff generated by the building addition. The design intent of the bioswale would be to slow down and provide some pollutant filtration and soil percolation of runoff, before discharging remaining unpercolated runoff into the Arboretum Waterway. For this reason, the bioswale would likely be located on the east side of the project, leading to the Waterway. A storm drain connection to the Arboretum Waterway would be made for instances when the swale could not retain and infiltrate the amount of runoff typically associated with a 10-year storm event, the current campus standard for assessing storm drain capacity for a project. The project also proposes installing stormwater planters (essentially cisterns) to manage stormwater runoff. The 2003 LRDP EIR found that development under the 2003 LRDP would increase impervious surfaces on the campus and could alter drainage patterns, thereby increasing runoff and loads of pollutants in storm water, which could adversely affect surface water quality (Impact 4.8-2). Discharge of storm water to the Arboretum Waterway is covered under a NPDES Phase II permit for small municipal storm water systems, which requires BMPs to reduce pollutants in storm water discharge to the maximum extent practicable. LRDP Mitigation 4.8-2 requires the campus to comply with Phase II regulations. As described in item (a) above, both construction and operation activities are required to employ BMPs. With implementation of Phase II requirements, increases in storm water runoff and levels of contaminants in runoff associated with implementation of the 2003 LRDP, including the proposed project, would have a less than significant impact on receiving waters.

The 2003 LRDP EIR found that development under the 2003 LRDP, in conjunction with construction activities, increased impervious surfaces, and alterations to drainage patterns associated with other development in the watershed could increase storm water runoff and could provide substantial sources of polluted runoff, which could adversely affect receiving water quality (Impact 4.8-10). LRDP Mitigations 4.8-10 (a-c) require the campus and regional jurisdictions to comply with NPDES Phase II requirements and implement SWPPPs for specified industrial and construction activities. However, implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.8-10(b) and (c) cannot be guaranteed by the University of California because it falls within other jurisdictions to enforce and monitor. Therefore, the impact is currently considered significant and unavoidable. This impact was adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and was fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information has become available since certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR that would alter this previous analysis.

d,e) The 2003 LRDP EIR found that implementation of the 2003 LRDP would alter drainage patterns in the project area and would increase impervious surfaces, which could exceed the capacity of storm water drainage systems and result in localized flooding and contribution to offsite flooding (Impact 4.8-3). Campus runoff is not expected to significantly increase peak flows in Putah Creek
under the 2003 LRDP because anticipated development represents only a minor increase in the percentage of impervious area in the watersheds. Campus discharges from the Arboretum Waterway to Putah Creek are not expected to exceed the existing pumping capacity of approximately 80 cfs (the current NPDES permit has a maximum discharge limit of 130 cfs). Pursuant to the campus Stormwater Management Plan, the current campus standard for storm water management is a 10-year storm event (Wengler 2005). However, under existing conditions, localized flooding on some portions of the campus occurs during a 2-year storm event. In most cases, this flooding consists of temporary water ponding at storm drain inlets and along roads that does not result in property damage or other serious consequences. Without any improvements, increased runoff associated with development under the 2003 LRDP, including the proposed project, would increase the likelihood of localized flooding (West Yost & Associates 2000). In accordance with LRDP Mitigation 4.8-3(a-b), included in the project, a drainage study has been performed for the proposed project to determine if capacity in the existing storm drainage system exists, and an additional storm drain connection will be made for the project to handle runoff that is not absorbed by the proposed bioswale and stormwater planters. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

The 2003 LRDP EIR also found that implementation of the 2003 LRDP in combination with regional development could alter drainage patterns and increase the rate or amount of surface runoff, which could cumulatively exceed the capacity of storm water drainage systems and result in flooding within the Putah Creek watershed (Impact 4.8-11). In most cases, this flooding consists of temporary water ponding at storm drain inlets and along roads that does not result in property damage or other serious consequences. With implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.8-11, storm water discharges from the campus would be reduced and would not contribute to regional flooding problems.

Storm water runoff pollution is evaluated further in items (a,f) and (c) above.

g) Under the 2003 LRDP, housing (including on-campus student housing and housing within the proposed neighborhood) would be constructed outside the 100-year flood zones on campus (see 2003 LRDP EIR, Figure 4.8-4, 100-Year Floodplain). The project does not include housing. Therefore, no impact would occur.

h, i) The 2003 LRDP EIR found that development under the 2003 LRDP could place non-residential structures within a 100-year floodplain, which could expose people and structures to risks associated with flooding and/or could impede or redirect flows, contributing to flood hazards (LRDP Impact 4.8-9). The FEMA Flood Zones map for the campus indicates that the Arboretum Waterway, which at one time was the stream channel for Putah Creek, is in the 100-year flood plain. When projected at a larger scale, the map appears to capture a portion of the proposed project site in the 100-year floodplain; however, this would seem to be an issue of precision related to map scaling. The Arboretum Waterway is now a remnant channel, cut off from direct flow to Putah Creek, and is managed as a stormwater detention pond, and volume of the Waterway is maintained through allowing the excess water to overtop a weir and then be pumped to the South Fork of Putah Creek. Additionally, the steep change in elevation from the Waterway bottom to the project site (17 feet) and channel width (approximately 36 feet) near the project site makes site flooding unlikely. Therefore, this impact is considered to be less than significant.

The campus is located approximately 23 miles downstream of the Monticello Dam (forming Lake Berryessa) and approximately 15 miles downstream of the Putah Diversion Dam. An inundation study prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation shows that, in the highly unlikely case of a dam breach, the campus (as well as the City of Davis) would be inundated under a maximum of 3 to 9 feet of water approximately 3.5 to 4 hours following the breach (USBR 1998). However, the probability of such a release is far less than one in one million (USBR 2000). As of June 2000,
Monticello Dam was determined to be in satisfactory condition, and the dam exhibited no unusual cracks, seeps, or deformations. In addition, the State Department of Dam Safety evaluates dams regularly, which would give adequate time to respond to any deterioration in the safety of the structure. Therefore, the risk of flooding on campus as a result of a dam failure is considered to be a less-than-significant impact.

j) The campus is not subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The campus is generally flat and is not located in close proximity to any large water bodies. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**Summary**

Mitigation Measures 4.8-1, 4.8-2, 4.8-3(a-b), 4.8-4(a-b), 4.8-5(a-d), 4.8-6(a-e), 4.8-10(a-c), 4.8-11, 4.8-12, 4.8-13(a-b), and 4.8-14(a-b) from the 2003 LRDP EIR are relevant to the proposed project and reduce the significance of hydrology and water quality impacts to the extent feasible. The proposed project would not exceed the levels of significance of hydrology and water quality impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant hydrology and water quality impacts that were not previously addressed.
7.9 LAND USE & PLANNING

7.9.1 Background

Section 4.9 of the 2003 LRDP EIR addresses the land use and planning effects of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP. The following discussion summarizes information presented in the 'Setting' subsection of Section 4.9 of the 2003 LRDP EIR.

Campus

The approximately 5,300-acre UC Davis campus is located within Yolo and Solano counties. Local land use is predominantly agricultural, with small cities and towns. The campus is surrounded by extensive agricultural uses to the west and south and by residential, institutional, and commercial land uses in the City of Davis, to the north and east. The City of Davis is a university-oriented community with over 62,000 residents. The UC Davis campus consists of four general units: the central campus, the south campus, the west campus, and Russell Ranch. In addition, the University of California owns several properties in the City of Davis, including buildings in downtown Davis and buildings and vacant parcels in the South Davis Research Park, located south of I-80.

As a state entity, UC Davis is not subject to municipal policies such as the City of Davis General Plan. Nevertheless, such policies are of interest to the campus. The campus has a tradition of working cooperatively with the local communities and it is University policy to seek consistency with local plans and policies, where feasible.

The 2003 LRDP is the campus' primary land use planning guide. It designates campus lands for the following uses through 2015-16: Academic and Administrative (High and Low Density); Teaching and Research Fields; Teaching and Research Open Space; Parking; Physical Education, Intercollegiate Athletics, and Recreation (PE/ICA/Recreation); Research Park (High and Low Density); Formal Open Space; Community Gardens; Faculty/Staff Housing, Student Housing; Mixed Use Housing; and Elementary School.

Project Site

The project site is currently used for the School of Law, and the 2003 LRDP designates the site for academic and administrative uses, which is descriptive of the current and planned uses of the site.

7.9.2 2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance

The 2003 LRDP EIR considers a land use and planning impact significant if growth under the 2003 LRDP would:

- Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.
- Result in development of land uses that are substantially incompatible with existing adjacent land uses or with planned uses.
- Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

An additional standard from the CEQA Guidelines' Environmental Checklist ("a" in the checklist below) was found not applicable to campus growth under the 2003 LRDP.

7.9.3 2003 LRDP EIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 related to land use and planning are evaluated in Section 4.9 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. As analyzed in Section 4 of this Initial Study, the proposed project is within the scope of analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR. The 2003 LRDP EIR did not identify any potentially significant or significant land use and planning impacts. The less than significant land use and planning impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR do not require mitigation.

7.9.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE &amp; PLANNING</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact for which 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in development of land uses that are substantially incompatible with existing adjacent land uses or with planned uses?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) The proposed project would have no potential to physically divide an established community. No impact would occur and no additional analysis is required.

b) The applicable land use plan for the campus is the 2003 LRDP. The project site is consistent with the 2003 LRDP Academic and Administrative land use designation. No impact would occur.

c) The campus does not fall within the boundaries of, nor is it adjacent to, an adopted regional HCP or NCCP. The campus has implemented two low effects HCPs for VELB at Russell Ranch. The project is not located at Russell Ranch. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with an adopted HCP or NCCP.

d) The 2003 LRDP EIR identifies that an impact could result if land uses are developed under the 2003 LRDP EIR that are substantially incompatible with existing adjacent land uses or with planned uses. Situated near administrative and academic facilities, and in proximity to the Arboretum, the proposed renovation and addition to the existing law school is compatible with the site’s context and with existing and planned adjacent land uses. No impact would occur.

Summary

The 2003 LRDP EIR did not identify any significant land use and planning impacts, nor did it identify any associated mitigation measures. The proposed project would not exceed the levels of significance of land use and planning impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant land use and planning impacts that were not previously addressed.
7.10 MINERAL RESOURCES

7.10.1 Background

Section 4.6, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, of the 2003 LRDP EIR briefly addresses mineral resources issues. The 2003 LRDP EIR concludes that development on campus would not impede extraction or result in the loss of availability of mineral resources.

Sand and gravel are important mineral resources in the region (CDOC 2000). However, natural gas is the only known or potential mineral resource that has been identified on campus. Natural gas can be extracted at wells placed considerable distances from deposits. No other known or potential mineral resources have been identified on the UC Davis campus. Therefore, development on campus does not impede extraction or result in the loss of availability of mineral resources.

7.10.2 2003 LRDP EIR

Because development on campus would not impede extraction or result in the loss of availability of mineral resources, the 2003 LRDP EIR did not identify any standards of significance, impacts, or mitigation measures associated with mineral resources. As analyzed in Section 4 of this Initial Study, the proposed project is within the scope of analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR.

7.10.3 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MINERAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact for which 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a, b) Natural gas is the only known or potential mineral resource that has been identified on campus. Natural gas can be extracted at wells placed considerable distances from deposits. Therefore, development on campus would not impede extraction or result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No impact would occur and no further analysis is required.
7.11 Noise

7.11.1 Background

Section 4.10 of the 2003 LRDP EIR addresses the noise effects of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP. The following discussion summarizes information presented in the ‘Setting’ subsection of Section 4.10 of the 2003 LRDP EIR.

Campus

The primary noise source in the vicinity of the campus is vehicular traffic using I-80, SR 113, and local roads. Other sources of noise include occasional aircraft over-flights associated with the University Airport located on the west campus and another small airport in the vicinity, agricultural activities, railroads, and landscaping activities. Land use surrounding the campus is primarily agricultural, with residential, commercial, and other uses concentrated along the northern and eastern boundaries of the main campus.

Sound is technically described in terms of amplitude (loudness) and frequency (pitch). The standard unit of sound amplitude measurement is the decibel (dB), and the decibel scale adjusted for A-weighting (dBA) is a special frequency-dependent rating scale that relates to the frequency sensitivity of the human ear. Community noise usually consists of a base of steady “ambient” noise that is the sum of many distant and indistinguishable noise sources, as well as more distinct sounds from individual local sources. A number of noise descriptors are used to analyze the effects of community noise on people, including the following:

- \( L_{eq} \), the equivalent energy noise level, is the average acoustic energy content of noise, measured during a prescribed period, typically one hour.
- \( L_{dn} \), the Day-Night Average Sound Level, is a 24-hour-average \( L_{eq} \) with a 10 dBA “penalty” added to noise occurring during the hours of 10:00 PM to 7:00 AM to account for greater nocturnal noise sensitivity.
- \( CNEL \), the Community Noise Equivalent Level, is a 24-hour-average \( L_{eq} \) with a “penalty” of 5 dB added to evening noise occurring between 7:00 PM and 10:00 PM, and a “penalty” of 10 dB added to nighttime noise occurring between 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM.

Noise monitoring over a 24-hour period in 2003 at sites located in urban areas on and adjacent to the campus (including areas next to freeways, roads, residences, and academic buildings) reflected CNEL levels ranging from 63 to 65 dBA CNEL. Ambient noise levels measured over a short period at various urban sites on campus varied from 49 to 63 dBA \( L_{eq} \).

Project Site

Mrak Hall Drive, east of the project site, and Parking Lot 3, north of the project site, both bring some traffic noise to the site. To the south of the project site, the campus Arboretum is a quiet environment. West of the site, the O&M Complex does generate mechanical equipment noise and traffic noise. Existing sources of noise originating from the project site include the operation of the building's mechanical equipment, deliveries to the law school's loading dock, and noise associated with maintenance of the site landscape.

7.11.2 2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance
The 2003 LRDP EIR considers a noise impact significant if growth under the 2003 LRDP would result in the following:

- Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of levels set forth in Table 4.10-3 of the 2003 LRDP EIR.

### Table 7.11.2: Thresholds of Significance for Noise Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Source</th>
<th>Criterion Noise Level</th>
<th>Substantial Increase in Noise Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Road Traffic and Other Long-Term Sources | 65 dBA CNEL | >=3 dBA if CNEL w/project is >= 65 dBA  
>=5 dBA if CNEL w/project is 50–64 dBA  
>=10 dBA if CNEL w/project is < 50 dBA |
| Stadium (Periodic, intermittent) | 70 dBA L_{eq,th}^a  
Daytime (7:00 a-7:00 p)  
70 dBA L_{eq,th}  
Evening (7:00 p-11:00 p)  
65 dBA L_{eq,th}  
nighttime (11:00 p-7:00 a) | Not Applicable |
| Railroad | Within 750 feet of railroad line^d | |
| Aircraft | 65 dBA CNEL | >=1.5 dBA if CNEL w/project is >= 65 dBA  
>=3 dBA if CNEL w/project is 60–64 dBA  
>=5 dBA if CNEL w/project is < 60 dBA |
| Construction (temporary) | 80 dBA L_{eq,th}^a  
daytime (7:00 a-7:00 p)  
80 dBA L_{eq,th}^a  
evening (7:00 p-11:00 p)  
70 dBA L_{eq,th}^a  
nighttime (11:00 p-7:00 a) | Not Applicable |

Source: 2003 LRDP EIR

^a The 2003 LRDP would not substantially increase rail activity; therefore, a threshold of significance for rail noise is not included in this table.

^b At noise-sensitive land use unless otherwise noted. Noise-sensitive land uses include residential and institutional land uses.

^c L_{eq,th} is an average measurement over a one-hour period.

^d Screening analysis distance criterion from FTA 1995.

^e L_{eq,th} is an average measurement over an eight-hour period.

- Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.
- A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.
- A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.
- For a project 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, exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

### 7.11.3 2003 LRDP EIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 related to noise are evaluated in Section 4.10 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. As analyzed in Section 4 of this Initial Study, the proposed project is within the scope of analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR. Significant and potentially significant noise impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are relevant to the proposed project are presented below with their corresponding levels of significance before and after application of mitigation measures identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR.
Mitigation measures in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are applicable to the proposed project are presented below. Since these mitigation measures are already being carried out as part of implementation of the 2003 LRDP, they will not be readopted in this Initial Study or Negative Declaration. The benefits of these mitigation measures will be achieved independently of considering them as specific mitigation measures of this project. Nothing in this Initial Study in any way alters the obligations of the campus to implement 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures.

### 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

**NOISE**

4.10-1 Prior to initiation of construction, the campus shall approve a construction noise mitigation program including but not limited to the following:

- Construction equipment shall be properly outfitted and maintained with feasible noise-reduction devices to minimize construction-generated noise.
- Stationary noise sources such as generators or pumps shall be located 100 feet away from noise-sensitive land uses as feasible.
- Laydown and construction vehicle staging areas shall be located 100 feet away from noise-sensitive land uses as feasible.
- Whenever possible, academic, administrative, and residential areas that will be subject to construction noise shall be informed a week before the start of each construction project.
- Loud construction activity (i.e., construction activity such as jackhamming, concrete sawing, asphalt removal, and large-scale grading operations) within 100 feet of a residential or academic building shall not be scheduled during finals week.
- Loud construction activity as described above within 100 feet of an academic or residential use shall, to the extent feasible, be scheduled during holidays, Thanksgiving breaks, Christmas break, Spring break, or Summer break.
- Loud construction activity within 100 feet of a residential or academic building shall be restricted to occur between 7:30 AM and 7:30 PM.

### 7.11.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

**NOISE**

Would the project...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact for which 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?  
   - [ ]  
   - [ ]  
   - [ ]  
   - [ ]  
   - [ ]  

---

a,c) The proposed project would not result in additional vehicle trips, nor increase noise levels associated with traffic on campus. Generation of noise levels on or adjacent to the project site associated with building mechanical equipment operation, loading dock deliveries, and landscape maintenance would contribute to ambient noise levels on campus. Any change in noise volume is expected to be minimal. The impacts would be less than significant.

b,d) The proposed project would use conventional construction techniques and machinery. Extensive site grading, demolition of portions of the existing facility, and concrete pours would be required, all of which generate construction-related noise. No pile driving, blasting, or other special construction techniques are anticipated as part of this project. It is anticipated that project construction would last for approximately two years. At peak construction for the addition, it is estimated that about 2 to 3 pieces of heavy construction equipment and 10 to 20 construction vehicles (primarily contractor pick-up trucks) would be on the project site. For the renovation, dumpsters and hauling trucks would be used during demolition activities, and about 5-10 construction vehicles would be on the project site.

The 2003 LRDP EIR found that construction of campus facilities pursuant to the 2003 LRDP could expose nearby receptors to excessive groundborne vibration and airborne or groundborne noise (Impact 4.10-1). Construction under the 2003 LRDP, including the proposed project, would require temporary construction activities using conventional construction techniques and equipment that would not generate substantial levels of vibration or groundborne noise. Routine noise levels from conventional construction activities (with the normal number of equipment operating on the site) range from 75 to 86 dBA Leq at a distance of 50 feet, from 69 to 80 dBA Leq at a distance of 100 feet, from 55 to 66 dBA Leq at a distance of 500 feet, and 48 to 60 dBA Leq at a distance of 1,000 feet (although noise levels would likely be lower due to additional attenuation from ground effects, air absorption, and shielding from miscellaneous intervening structures). Noise from project construction is predicted to be below the significance criteria of 80 dBA Leq daytime and evening and 70 dBA Leq nighttime at a distance of 100 feet or more from the construction activity. However, noise from construction would be audible and would temporarily elevate the local ambient noise level to some degree at distances greater than 100 feet from construction. The School of Law has a small parent co-operative nursery for the infants of law school students; up to six infants are accommodated in the nursery while their parents attend classes (King Hall 2006). The School's faculty, staff, students, and nursery infants would continue to occupy the existing building during construction of the proposed project. These occupants' use of the facility is frequently dependent upon conditions conducive to quiet activities. Therefore, LRDP Mitigation 4.10-1, included in the proposed project, would be implemented to control
construction noise. One implementation aspect of measure 4.10-1 would include the preparation of a construction noise mitigation program. The parameters for the construction noise mitigation program would be developed by ORMP, Architects & Engineers, and the design team, and incorporated into construction contract specifications prior to selection of a general contractor and onset of construction activities. The potential impact would be less than significant.

e) The project site is approximately 2 miles from University Airport. The 2003 LRDP, including the proposed project, does not propose changes to University Airport operations, nor does it propose occupied uses within the airport’s 65 CNEL noise contour. The project would not expose people to excessive noise levels associated with this public use airport, and no impact would occur.

f) The University Airport is a public use airport, not a private airstrip. No other private airport facilities are within the immediate vicinity of the campus. No impact would occur. Refer to item e) above for discussion of potential noise impacts associated with the campus’ public use airports.

**Summary**

Mitigation measure 4.10-1 from the 2003 LRDP EIR is relevant to the proposed project and reduces the significance of noise impacts to the extent feasible. The proposed project would not exceed the levels of significance of noise impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant noise impacts that were not previously addressed.
7.12 **Population & Housing**

7.12.1 **Background**

Section 4.11 of the 2003 LRDP EIR addresses the population and housing effects of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP. The following discussion summarizes information presented in the ‘Setting’ subsection of Section 4.11 of the 2003 LRDP EIR.

The on-campus population at UC Davis includes students, faculty/staff, and non-UC Davis affiliates working on campus. The current and projected campus population figures are presented in Table 1 of this Tiered Initial Study. As of 2003, approximately 80 percent of the student population and 50 percent of the employee population lived in the Davis area, and approximately 94 percent of students and 90 percent of employees lived within the three-county area of Yolo, Solano, and Sacramento counties. Outside the City of Davis, the predominant residence locations of students and employees are Woodland, West Sacramento, Winters, Dixon, Vacaville, and Fairfield (UC Davis ORMP 2003d).

Vacancy rates in the City of Davis are considered low, and housing costs in the City are generally higher than those elsewhere in the region. Since 1994, the campus has been working toward the goals of maintaining a UC Davis housing supply that can accommodate 25 percent of the on-campus enrolled students and can offer housing to all eligible freshmen. The 2003 LRDP focuses on providing additional on-campus student housing that will accommodate a total of approximately 7,800 students on the core campus (or 26 percent of the peak student enrollment through 2015-16) and an additional 3,000 students in a west campus neighborhood. The campus currently offers one faculty and staff housing area (Aggie Village), which includes 21 single-family units (17 of which have cottages) and 16 duplexes. The 2003 LRDP plans to provide an additional 500 faculty and staff housing units within the west campus neighborhood through 2015-16.

**Project Site**

The project site currently houses the School of Law, which the proposed project would expand. No housing is located or planned on or adjacent to the project site. The proposed project would not add any members to the campus population.

7.12.2 **2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance**

The 2003 LRDP EIR considers an impact related to population and housing significant if growth under the 2003 LRDP would:

- Directly induce substantial population growth in the area by proposing new housing and employment.
- Create a demand for housing that could not be accommodated by local jurisdictions.
- Induce substantial population growth in an area indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

Additional standards from the CEQA Guidelines’ Environmental Checklist (“b” and “c” in the checklist below) was found not applicable to campus growth under the 2003 LRDP.

7.12.3 **2003 LRDP EIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 related to population and housing are evaluated in Section 4.11 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. As analyzed in Section 4 of this Initial Study, the
The proposed project is within the scope of analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR. There are no significant population and housing impacts that were identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are relevant to the proposed project because the project would not bring new students or employees to the campus.

### 7.12.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

#### POPULATION & HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project…</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact for which 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a demand for housing that cannot be accommodated by local jurisdictions?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) The proposed project would result in no increase in the campus population. The project purpose is to relieve current over-crowding and substandard conditions in the School of Law for competitive and accreditation needs. The project does not propose to increase student enrollment or faculty or staff employees. No impact would occur.

The project would include utilities improvements to domestic water, utility water, chilled water, steam, and sanitary sewer lines. However, the 2003 LRDP EIR found that implementation of the 2003 LRDP, including the proposed project, would not induce substantial population growth in the area indirectly through the extension of roads or other infrastructure because these extensions would not be provided with excess capacity in an area where lack of infrastructure is an obstacle to growth.

b-d) The proposed project would not increase the campus population, displace any existing housing, displace substantial numbers of people, or create a demand for housing that could not be accommodated by local jurisdictions. Therefore, no impacts to population or housing would occur.

#### Summary

The 2003 LRDP EIR did not identify any mitigation measures to reduce the significance of impacts associated with population and housing. The proposed project would not exceed the levels of significance of population and housing impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant population and housing impacts that were not previously addressed.
Section 4.12 of the 2003 LRDP EIR addresses the public services effects of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP. The following discussion summarizes information presented in the ‘Setting’ subsection of Section 4.13 of the 2003 LRDP EIR.

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, this Public Services analysis evaluates the environmental effects associated with any physical changes required to meet increases in demand for public services, including police, fire protection, schools, and libraries. Project-level public services impacts are addressed by evaluating the effects of on-campus population growth on public services that directly serve the on-campus population (primarily UC Davis services). Cumulative public services impacts are addressed by evaluating the effects of off-campus population growth on the public services in the Cities of Davis, Dixon, Winters, and Woodland.

UC Davis provides most public services needed on campus, including fire protection, police protection, and library services. The Davis Joint Unified School District serves the City of Davis and portions of Yolo and Solano counties. These services are discussed further below:

- **Fire Protection**: The UC Davis Fire Department provides primary fire response and prevention, natural disaster response, hazardous materials incident response, and emergency medical service to the main campus. The fire department's goal is to respond to 90 percent of campus emergency calls within 6 minutes (UC Davis Fire Department 2003). As of 2003, the UC Davis Fire Department achieves its stated standard of response (Chandler 2003).

- **Police**: In 2001-02, the UC Davis Police Department employed approximately 32 sworn officers to provide 24-hour service to the main campus and facilities owned and leased by UC Davis in the City of Davis, a service area including a campus population of approximately 36,445 people (including UC and non-UC employees, students, and dependents living in on-campus housing) (Chang 2001). Although the campus does not currently rely on any level of service standards, the Police Department has indicated that it would like to reach and maintain 1 sworn officer on the main campus per 1,000 members of the campus population. In 2001-02, the campus was just under this level, with approximately 0.9 sworn officers per 1,000 members of the campus population.

- **Schools**: In 2001-02 a total of approximately 8,677 students were enrolled in the DJUSD's nine elementary schools, two junior high schools, one high school, one continuation high school, and one independent study program. The DJUSD estimates student enrollment based on a rate of 0.69 student per single-family residential unit and 0.44 student per multi-family residential unit in its service area.

- **Libraries**: UC Davis currently has four main libraries, distributed among the academic centers of the central campus, which serve students, faculty, staff, and the general public, including: Shields Library (the main campus library located centrally on the core campus), the Carlson Health Sciences Library, the Law Library, and the Physical Sciences and Engineering Library.

**Project Site**

The project site currently houses the School of Law, which has a law library that is open to limited public use. The law library would remain on the project site and open to the public.

**7.13.2 2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance**
The 2003 LRDP EIR considers a public services impact significant if growth under the 2003 LRDP would:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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.

Effects associated with recreation services are evaluated in Section 7.14, Recreation, and effects associated with the capacity of the domestic fire water system to provide adequate fire protection are evaluated in Section 7.16, Utilities.

### 7.13.3 2003 LRDP EIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on public services are evaluated in Section 4.12 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. As analyzed in Section 4 of this Initial Study, the proposed project is within the scope of analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR. No significant public services impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR are relevant to the proposed project.

### 7.13.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact for which 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) 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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Fire protection?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Police protection?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Schools?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Parks?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[X]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a, i-v) UC Davis Fire and Police Protection

The proposed project would renovate and expand the existing law school facility, which currently has fire sprinklers only in the basement. The renovation element of the project would install fire sprinklers throughout the existing building, improving fire safety and meeting current building code. The proposed project would not increase the campus population, and is not expected to result in an increase in the demand for campus fire and police services or regional fire and police services above the demand that is anticipated under the 2003 LRDP. No impact would occur.

a, iii) Schools
The proposed project would not increase the campus population, and, accordingly, would not contribute to the number of school-age persons living in the region. No impact on school demand would occur.

a, iv) Effects associated with parks are evaluated in Section 7.14, Recreation.

a, v) Libraries

The project would not increase the campus population, and thus would not increase demand on library resources and access in the region. The proposed renovation would improve the existing law library, which offers limited public access, in addition to serving the law school. No impact would occur.

Summary

No mitigation measures from the 2003 LRDP EIR are relevant to the proposed project and reduce the significance of public service-related impacts to the extent feasible. The proposed project would not exceed the levels of significance of public service impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant public service impacts that were not previously addressed.
7.14 RECREATION

7.14.1 Background

Section 4.13 of the 2003 LRDP EIR addresses the environmental effects associated with modifying recreational resources to meet campus growth under the 2003 LRDP. The following discussion summarizes information presented in the ‘Setting’ subsection of Section 4.13 of the 2003 LRDP EIR.

UC Davis contains many park-like areas and recreation facilities. Park facilities at UC Davis range in size from small picnic and landscaped areas within campus housing areas to extensively landscaped areas in the academic core of the central campus, such as the Arboretum. Areas such as the Quad, the landscaped areas along A Street and Russell Boulevard, the Putah Creek Riparian Reserve in the west campus, and many areas within the Arboretum are used regularly by members of the UC Davis campus and visitors to the campus.

Recreation facilities on the campus include structures, bike paths, and fields used for physical education, intercollegiate athletics, intramural sports, sports clubs, and general recreation. Recreation structures include Hickey Gym, Recreation Hall, the Recreation Swimming Pool, and Recreation Lodge. In addition, two major campus recreation facilities are currently under construction: the Activities and Recreation Center and the Schaal Aquatic Center. The general public may purchase privilege cards to use some campus recreation facilities, or may join community or campus organizations that have access to some facilities.

Project Site

The campus Arboretum is adjacent to the project site. The Arboretum is a regional recreational amenity open to the public. There are no existing or planned recreation facilities on the project site.

7.14.2 2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance

The 2003 LRDP EIR considers a recreation impact significant if growth under the 2003 LRDP would:

- Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreation facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.
- Propose the construction of recreation facilities or require the expansion of recreation facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

7.14.3 2003 LRDP EIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 associated with recreation are evaluated in Section 4.13 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. As analyzed in Section 4 of this Initial Study, the proposed project is within the scope of analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR and would not contribute to recreation impacts as identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR.

7.14.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECREATION</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact for which 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

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?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

a,b) The proposed project would not increase the campus population, would not add to the demand for parks or recreational facilities on or off campus, and would not include any indoor or outdoor recreational facilities. The proposed project would temporarily disrupt use of a northern path along the Arboretum in order to relocate some utility lines for the project. Access on the northern path otherwise would be maintained during construction except during relocation of the lines and repaving of the path. The project would not permanently impinge on access to or use of the Arboretum. No impact would occur.

Summary

No mitigation measures from the 2003 LRDP EIR are relevant to the proposed project to reduce the significance of recreation-related impacts to the extent feasible. The proposed project would not exceed the levels of significance of recreation impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant recreation impacts that were not previously addressed.
7.15 Transportation, Circulation, & Parking

7.15.1 Background

Section 4.14 of the 2003 LRDP EIR addresses the transportation, circulation, and parking effects of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP. The following discussion summarizes information presented in the ‘Setting’ subsection of Section 4.14 of the 2003 LRDP EIR.

Campus

UC Davis is served by six main campus roadways or “gateways” that connect the campus to residential and downtown areas in the City of Davis, and two gateways that provide direct access to regional freeways (I-80 and SR 113). Circulation within the central campus is accommodated primarily by the campus “loop” roadway system, which includes Russell Boulevard, A Street, New and Old Davis Road, California Avenue, and La Rue Road. Other roadways within the core campus area are restricted to transit and emergency vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians. Primary vehicular access to the south campus is provided by Old Davis Road, to the west campus by Hutchison Drive, and to Russell Ranch by Russell Boulevard.

Level of service (LOS) is a general measure of traffic operating conditions whereby a letter grade, from A (the best) to F (the worst), is assigned to roadway intersections. These grades represent the comfort and convenience associated with driving from the driver’s perspective. To assess the worst-case traffic conditions, LOS is measured during morning (7 to 9 AM) and afternoon (4 to 6 PM) peak commute times. The LOS of campus roadways varies. Monitoring of campus intersections during peak hours in Fall 2001 and Fall 2002 found that the Hutchison Drive/Health Sciences Drive intersection (with LOS E during the PM peak hour) was the only study intersection to operate below the campus’ operation standard (standards are identified in the following section). The campus is planning on installing a traffic signal at this intersection by fall 2006.

Bicycles are a major component of the transportation system at UC Davis and in the City of Davis. UC Davis has an extensive system of bicycle paths, which makes bicycles a popular form of travel on campus. The UC Davis Bicycle Plan (UC Davis 2002) estimates that 15,000 to 18,000 bicycles travel to the campus on a typical weekday during the Fall and Spring sessions when the weather is good.

Parking at UC Davis is provided by a combination of surface lots and parking structures. UC Davis Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) oversees parking services on campus including selling parking passes, providing traffic control at special events, ticketing violators, and measuring parking utilization throughout campus on a quarterly basis. Approximately 14,500 parking spaces were provided on campus as of 2001-02.

Project Site

The project site has an address on Mrak Hall Drive, to the east of the site. There is a maintenance and delivery alley adjacent to the site on the west. Parking Lot 3 is immediately north of the site. Construction staging areas associated with the proposed project are expected to be on the north and east edges of the site, along Parking Lot 3 and Mrak Hall Drive, west of Parking Lot 3, and adjacent to the South Entry Parking Structure, depending upon project phase and site requirements. Contractor parking would be purchased in Parking Lot 1, south of the South Entry Parking Structure.

7.15.2 2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance
The 2003 LRDP EIR considers a transportation, circulation, and parking impact significant if growth under the 2003 LRDP would:

- Cause an increase in the traffic that may be substantial in relation to the existing roadway capacity of the street system as indicated by LOS standards for congestion at intersections.

The addition of project traffic causing a LOS change from acceptable to unacceptable would have a significant impact. The following LOS thresholds apply to the study intersections.

- LOS D is the minimum acceptable LOS for UC Davis.
- LOS E is the minimum acceptable LOS for the City of Davis. LOS F is acceptable for the City of Davis Core Area.
- LOS E is the minimum acceptable LOS for I-80 and its associated interchanges.
- LOS C is the minimum acceptable LOS for SR 113 and its associated interchanges.

In addition, the project would have a significant impact if the project adds 10 or more vehicles to the volume of a study intersection that is expected to operate unacceptably without the project. For intersections that operate unacceptably without the project, even a small amount of additional traffic could increase the delay. For this EIR, future volumes are rounded to the nearest 10; therefore, 10 vehicles is the minimum amount of traffic that could be added to an intersection already operating at an unacceptable level.

Increased intersection congestion would also be a significant impact if it would exceed a LOS standard established by the county congestion management agency (or any affected agency or jurisdiction) for designated roads or highways.

- LOS E is the minimum acceptable LOS for roadways and intersections in Solano County.
- LOS E is the minimum acceptable LOS for I-80 and its associated interchanges between the Solano County limit and Olive Drive.
- LOS E is the minimum acceptable LOS for SR 113 and its associated interchanges within the Davis city limits.
- LOS E is the minimum acceptable LOS for Russell Boulevard between SR 113 and B Street.
- LOS E is the minimum acceptable LOS for Richards Boulevard between First Street and I-80.
- LOS E is the minimum acceptable LOS for First Street between B Street and Richards Boulevard.
- LOS E is the minimum acceptable LOS for B Street between First Street and 5th Street.

- Result in inadequate parking capacity.

For parking, a project would be considered to have a significant impact if it is expected to increase the winter utilization rate to over 90 percent on the central campus, Health Sciences District, and/or major facilities of the west and south campus without adequate time (usually 24 months) to implement a parking solution to campus construction standards.

- Conflict with applicable adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks).
Impacts related to safety risks associated with the UC Davis airport and emergency access are discussed in Section 7.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The 2003 LRDP would make only limited changes to the roadway network and would not create or increase hazards due to design features such as dangerous intersections.

7.15.3 2003 LRDP EIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on traffic, circulation, and parking are evaluated in Section 4.14 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. As analyzed in Section 4 of this Initial Study, the proposed project is within the scope of analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR. Significant and potentially significant traffic, circulation, and parking impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are relevant to the proposed project are presented below with their corresponding levels of significance before and after application of mitigation measures identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2003 LRDP EIR Impacts</th>
<th>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.14-5 Growth in population levels in the core area of the central campus would result in increased conflicts between bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit vehicles, causing increased congestion and safety problems.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of Significance: LS=Less than Significant, S=Significant, PS=Potentially Significant, SU=Significant and Unavoidable

Mitigation measures in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are applicable to the proposed project are presented below. Since these mitigation measures are already being carried out as part of implementation of the 2003 LRDP, they will not be readopted in this Initial Study or Negative Declaration. The benefits of these mitigation measures will be achieved independently of considering them as specific mitigation measures of this project. Nothing in this Initial Study in any way alters the obligations of the campus to implement 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.14-5 UC Davis shall monitor core area pedestrian and bike activity and accidents. UC Davis shall improve bike and pedestrian facilities or alter transit operations to avoid increased bicycle accident rates or safety problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.15.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSPORTATION, CIRCULATION, &amp; PARKING</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact for which 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a, b) Construction of the proposed project would generate vehicle trips on adjacent roadways. During construction of the proposed addition, there will be periodic deliveries of building materials that may disrupt traffic movement on Mrak Hall Drive and in Parking Lot 3, possibly for up to an hour at a time. In addition, during the approximately two-week period of concrete pours, there will be frequent trips by concrete pouring trucks. During the proposed renovation of the existing building, there will be deliveries of building materials, as well as some trips by hauling trucks delivering and removing construction dumpsters for the demolition component. Construction of the chilled water and steam utility line upgrades would require deliveries of construction materials and likely would disrupt traffic movement on California Avenue. This short-term increase in traffic would be adequately accommodated by existing roadways. Operation of the proposed project would not contribute to the campus population or otherwise increase daily vehicular traffic and thus would not result in additional trips to or from the campus during the A.M. or P.M. peak hours. Therefore, the traffic impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

c) Impacts related to safety risks associated with the UC Davis airport are discussed in Section 7.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

d) The 2003 LRDP EIR identified that growth under the 2003 LRDP would increase conflicts between bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit vehicles on the core campus, resulting in increased congestion and safety problems (Impact 4.14-5). The project would not contribute to the campus population. However, the project does propose to relocate the Arneson sculpture to the Mrak Hall Drive circle. The installation of this art piece could change existing lines of sight and traffic interactions in the circle. The proposed project would also plan for new pedestrian crossings at Mrak Circle (see Figure 3.7). LRDP Mitigation 4.14-5, included in the proposed project, requires UC Davis to continue to monitor pedestrian and bike activity and accidents on the core campus, and to improve bike and pedestrian facilities or alter transit operations to reduce accident rates or safety problems. The proposed placement of the sculptures and pedestrian crossings was reviewed by a traffic engineer (Fehr & Peers 2006). The study’s conclusions regarding height and arrangement of the sculpture pieces and findings regarding the pedestrian crossings would be incorporated into the project design in order to respect public safety needs. With mitigation 4.14-5, the impact would be less than significant.

e) Impacts related to emergency access are discussed in Section 7.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

f) The proposed project would not increase the campus population, and would not, therefore, generate additional parking demand. The project could use a few spaces in Parking Lot 3 or along the west side of Mrak Hall Drive, for temporary construction staging and deliveries, which would
result in a temporary loss of parking spaces during the approximately two year construction period. However, there is currently plenty of capacity in the South Entry Parking Structure to absorb the temporary loss of the spaces. The proposed relocation of the Arneson sculptures and placement of pedestrian crossings at the Mrak Drive Circle could result in the loss of three visitor parking spaces, which would be replaced in Parking Lot 3 by creating new spaces or by displacing three of the “A” type permit spaces. The South Entry Parking Structure has ample “A” type spaces to absorb three displaced spaces from Lot 3. During construction, contractor parking would be provided in Parking Lot 1, south of the South Entry Parking Structure. Current parking projections demonstrate ample vacant spaces during the construction period to accommodate the temporary need for contractor parking. The impact would be less than significant.

g) The proposed project would not increase the campus population, and therefore would not increase the demand for transit services. No impact would occur.

Summary

Mitigation measure 4.15-5 from the 2003 LRDP EIR is relevant to the proposed project and reduces the significance of transportation, circulation, and parking impacts to the extent feasible. The proposed project would not exceed the levels of significance of transportation, circulation, and parking impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant impacts that were not previously addressed.
7.16 Utilities & Service Systems

7.16.1 Background

Section 4.15 of the 2003 LRDP EIR addresses the effects of campus growth on utility systems under the 2003 LRDP. The campus provides the following utility and service systems to campus projects:

- Domestic/Fire Water
- Utility Water
- Agricultural Water
- Storm Drainage
- Wastewater
- Solid Waste
- Chilled Water
- Steam
- Electricity
- Natural Gas
- Telecommunications

The campus is required to comply with a UC-wide green building policy and clean energy standard. The policy encourages principles of energy efficiency and sustainability in the planning, financing, design, construction, renewal, maintenance, operation, space management, facilities utilization, and decommissioning of facilities and infrastructure to the extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements. In addition, the policy aims to minimize increased use of non-renewable energy by encouraging programs addressing energy efficiency, local renewable power and green power purchases from the electrical grid (UC Office of the President 2003).

Project Site

The campus evaluated utility services for the proposed project. The proposed project would use campus utilities and service systems including: domestic water, utility water, wastewater, storm drainage, solid waste, chilled water and steam, electricity, and telecommunications. These utilities and service systems are discussed below:

- **Domestic Water:** The campus' domestic/fire water system obtains water from six deep aquifer wells to serve the needs of campus buildings, landscape irrigation on the west and south campuses, and heating and cooling systems at the Central Heating and Cooling Plant (CHCP). The system includes approximately 144,000 linear feet of distribution pipelines, a water tower and a ground storage tank with a combined capacity of approximately 500,000 gallons, an underground storage reservoir with a capacity of approximately 1.3 million gallons, and a booster pump station. In 2001-02, annual domestic water consumption was approximately 2,670 acre feet and peak demand was 3,100 gallons per minute (gpm). The proposed project would have an estimated demand of 120 gpm (current demand is 110 gpm). The project would make a connection for the new addition at the existing service line in the mechanical room of the existing building of King Hall. An extension of the domestic water line would be required along the south edge of the project site to provide for required fire hydrants. The proposed project would add fire sprinklers throughout the existing building to upgrade the facility to current code requirements.

- **Utility Water:** The campus' utility water system obtains water from six intermediate-depth aquifer wells to provide water for landscape irrigation, greenhouse irrigation, and some laboratories. The system includes one 100,000-gallon water tower. In 2001-02, annual utility water consumption was approximately 1,170 acre feet and peak demand was 1.5 mgd. The existing line on the east side of King Hall would need to be relocated further east because of the building addition. The project would impose minimal additional demand on the utility water system.
- **Wastewater:** UC Davis operates a campus wastewater conveyance and treatment system that is independent from regional facilities. The campus Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) is located in the south campus, and treated effluent from the plant discharges to Putah Creek. The peak month capacity of the campus WWTP, as regulated under the existing NPDES permit issued by the CVRWQCB, is 2.7 mgd. Since the current WWTP began operation in March 2000, the maximum monthly flow has been 2.2 mgd. Maximum flow in 2001-02 was 1.6 mgd. An existing 8" sanitary sewer line that crosses the southeast corner of the proposed addition would be relocated, and the project would repair the existing path and landscaping disturbed as a result. The proposed project would make minimal, if any, additional demand on the system.

- **Storm Drainage:** The central campus and developed parts of the west and south campuses are served by campus storm water drainage systems. The central campus drainage system involves a system of underground pipes that drain to the Arboretum Waterway (providing the only major detention storage in the system), from which storm water is pumped to the South Fork of Putah Creek during large storm events. Existing drain inlets at the northeast and southeast corners of the existing building would be relocated as a result of the proposed addition. The courtyard drainage system would require reconfiguration with the renovation. Rainwater planters and a bioswale are proposed to handle all new runoff generated by the building addition. The design intent of the bioswale would be to slow down and provide some pollutant filtration and soil percolation of runoff, before discharging remaining unpercolated runoff into the Arboretum Waterway. For this reason, the bioswale would likely be located on the east side of the project, leading to the Waterway. A storm drain connection to the Arboretum Waterway would be made for instances when the swale could not retain and infiltrate the amount of runoff typically associated with a 10-year storm event, the current campus standard for assessing storm drain capacity for a project.

- **Solid Waste:** UC Davis provides solid waste collection and recycling services for the campus. All nonrecycled and nonhazardous solid wastes collected on campus are disposed at the campus owned and operated Class III sanitary landfill located in the west campus west of County Road 98 and north of Putah Creek. The campus sends approximately 8,700 tons of solid waste to the campus landfill per year (approximately 34 tons per working day). In addition, approximately 3,300 tons of wastes from the UC Davis Medical Center in Sacramento are disposed at the landfill each year. The permitted capacity of the landfill is 500 tons per day, and the landfill unit currently being used has anticipated capacity to serve the campus needs through 2023. In 2001-02, approximately 10,804 tons of materials were diverted for recycling and reuse. The amount of materials diverted represents approximately 55 percent of the total waste generated on campus.

- **Electricity:** The main campus currently receives electricity from the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA) through PG&E transmission lines at the campus substation located south of I-80. The campus electrical system has an available capacity of 64.4 megawatts (MW). Annual electrical usage on campus in 2001-02 was approximately 200 million kilowatt-hours (KWh) per year and peak demand was approximately 34,000 KW. The existing 750KVA unit substation in the existing building basement is inadequate for the existing building. The proposed project would include upgrading the building substation and switchboard to a size adequate to handle the existing building and the new addition, including a new transformer (located outdoors, on the west side of the project site). A new fire alarm system would be installed in the building to replace the existing system, which does not meet present day standards.

- **Chilled Water & Steam:** The campus chilled water and steam systems produce and convey steam to provide heat and chilled water to cool several buildings on the central campus. Campus buildings that are not connected to the campus chilled water and steam systems use...
individual heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems. The campus operates two main chilled water plants (the CHCP and the Thermal Energy Storage Plant) with a total system capacity of approximately 15,500 tons. The campus’ main steam plant is located in the CHCP. The total steam capacity at the CHCP is approximately 280,000 pounds per hour (pph) (including a 75,000 pph backup boiler for use in emergencies). The proposed project would require upgrade of offsite chilled water and steam utility lines. These upgrades likely would not be completed before the building renovation and addition were completed and occupied. Consequently, the project design would include options to provide cooling and heating to the building during the interim period between project completion and occupancy and the completion of the chilled water and steam pipeline upgrade (see Section 7.16.4, item “h”). Each of the possible options would allow for connections to the campus chilled water and steam loops upon completion of those upgrades. The campus could connect King Hall to these central campus utilities as soon as the upgrades are completed.

- **Telecommunications:** The majority of all telephone, data, video, and wireless infrastructure and facilities on campus are owned by the campus and operated by the UC Davis Communications Resources Department. The main campus switching facility is located in the Telecommunications Building. As new buildings are constructed, the Communications Resources Department coordinates with the UC Davis Office of Architects and Engineers to design and direct the installation of intra- and inter-building telecommunications facilities in accordance with established standards. Additional service would be provided to the building via existing conduit; no upgrades would be required.

### 7.16.2 2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance

The 2003 LRDP EIR considers a utilities and service systems impact significant if growth under the 2003 LRDP would:

- Exceed the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board’s wastewater treatment requirements.
- Require or result in the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities, which would cause significant environmental effects.
- Require or result in the construction or expansion of storm water drainage facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.
- Result in the need for new or expanded water supply entitlements.
- Exceed available wastewater treatment capacity.
- Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs.
- Fail to comply with applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.
- Require or result in the construction or expansion of electrical, natural gas, chilled water, or steam facilities, which would cause significant environmental impacts.
- Require or result in the construction or expansion of telecommunication facilities, which would cause significant environmental impacts.

### 7.16.3 2003 LRDP EIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures
Impacts of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP through 2015-16 on utilities and service systems are evaluated in Section 4.15 of the 2003 LRDP EIR. As analyzed in Section 4 of this Initial Study, the proposed project is within the scope of analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR. Significant and potentially significant utilities and service systems impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are relevant to the proposed project are presented below with their corresponding levels of significance before and after application of mitigation measures identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR. In addition, impacts 4.15-1, 4.15-2, 4.15-3, 4.15-4, 4.15-6, 4.15-8, and 4.15-9, presented below, are considered less than significant prior to mitigation, but mitigation measures were identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR to further reduce the significance of these impacts. Less than significant impacts that do not include mitigation are not presented here.

### 2003 LRDP EIR Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES &amp; SERVICE SYSTEMS</th>
<th>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</th>
<th>Level of Significance After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.15-1 Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of campus domestic/fire water extraction and conveyance systems, which would not cause significant environmental impacts.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15-2 Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of campus utility water extraction and conveyance systems, which would not cause significant environmental impacts.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15-3 Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of wastewater treatment and conveyance facilities, the construction and operation of which would not result in significant environmental impacts.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15-4 Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of campus storm drainage conveyance and detention facilities, which would not result in significant environmental impacts.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15-6 Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of the campus electrical system, which would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15-8 Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of campus chilled water and steam generation and conveyance facilities, which would not result in significant environmental impacts.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15-9 Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require expansion of campus communication facilities, which would not result in significant environmental impacts.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Levels of Significance: LS=Less than Significant, S=Significant, PS=Potentially Significant, SU=Significant and Unavoidable

Mitigation measures in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are applicable to the proposed project are presented below. Since these mitigation measures are already being carried out as part of implementation of the 2003 LRDP, they will not be readopted in this Initial Study or Negative Declaration. The benefits of these mitigation measures will be achieved independently of considering them as specific mitigation measures of this project. Nothing in this Initial Study in any way alters the obligations of the campus to implement 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures.

### 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UTILITIES &amp; SERVICE SYSTEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.15-1(a) Once preliminary project design is developed, the campus shall review each project to determine if existing domestic/fire water supply is adequate at the point of connection. If domestic/fire water is determined inadequate, the campus will upgrade the system to provide adequate water flow and pressure to the project site before constructing the project.
### 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

#### UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.15-1(b)</td>
<td>Implement domestic water conservation strategies as indicated in LRDP Mitigation 4.8-5(a) (see Section 7.8 Hydrology and Water Quality of this Tiered Initial Study).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15-2(a)</td>
<td>Once preliminary project design is developed, the campus shall review each project to determine whether existing utility water supply is adequate at the point of connection. If the utility water supply is determined to be inadequate, the campus will upgrade the system to provide adequate water flow to the project site prior to occupation or operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15-2(b)</td>
<td>Implement utility water conservation strategies as indicated in LRDP Mitigation 4.8-6(a) (see Section 7.8 Hydrology and Water Quality of this Tiered Initial Study).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15-3</td>
<td>Once preliminary project design is developed, the campus shall review each project to determine whether existing capacity of the sanitary sewer line at the point of connection is adequate. If the capacity of the sewer line is determined inadequate, the campus will upgrade the system to provide adequate service to the project site prior to occupation or operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15-4</td>
<td>Once preliminary project design is developed, the campus shall review each project to determine whether existing storm drainage system is adequate at the point of connection. If the storm drainage system is determined inadequate, the campus will upgrade the system to provide adequate storm water drainage and/or detention prior to occupation or operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15-6(a)</td>
<td>Once preliminary project design is developed, the campus shall review each project to determine whether the existing electrical system is adequate at the point of connection. If the electrical system is determined inadequate, the campus will upgrade the system to provide adequate service to the project prior to occupation or operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15-6(b)</td>
<td>The campus would continue to meet or exceed Title 24 energy conservation requirements for new buildings, and it would continue to incorporate energy efficient design elements outlined in the UC Davis Campus Standards &amp; Design Guide in new construction and retrofit projects. These energy conservation standards may be subject to modification as more stringent standards are developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15-8</td>
<td>Once preliminary project design is developed, the campus shall review each project to determine whether the existing chilled water and/or steam system is adequate at the point of connection. If the capacity of the pipelines is determined inadequate, the campus will upgrade the system to provide adequate service to the project site prior to occupation or operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15-9</td>
<td>Once preliminary project design is developed, the campus shall review each project to determine whether existing capacity of the telecommunications system is adequate. If the capacity is determined to be inadequate, the campus will upgrade the system to provide adequate service to the project site prior to occupation or operation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.16.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

**UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project…</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact for which 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  

☐ ☐ ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐

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 providers existing commitments?  

☐ ☐ ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?  

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

h) Require or result in the construction or expansion of electrical, natural gas, chilled water, or steam facilities, which would cause significant environmental impacts?  

☐ ☐ ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐

i) Require or result in the construction or expansion of telecommunication facilities, which would cause significant environmental impacts?  

☐ ☐ ☑ ☐ ☐ ☐

---

a) The proposed project would not increase the campus population. However, the project would add restrooms to the building, and could result in a slight increase in effluent. The permitted peak monthly average capacity of the campus WWTP is currently 2.7 mgd, and growth under the 2003 LRDP, including the proposed project, is anticipated to increase the volume of discharge to 3.85 mgd through 2013-16. As discussed further in item “a,f” in Section 7.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, with continuation of current practices and implementation of 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures, the campus anticipates meeting the WWTP’s permit requirements. Therefore, the impact associated with possible exceedances of WWTP requirements would be less than significant.

b) Domestic Water Facilities

The proposed project would connect the new addition to the campus domestic/fire water system with a 4-inch water service line and a 6-inch fire service line via the existing service line at the mechanical room in the existing building. Fire sprinklers would be installed throughout the existing facility, as well as in the addition, as part of the project. A connection to the domestic water system would be made for the new fire sprinklers. An extension of the domestic water line would be required along the south edge of the project site to provide for required fire hydrants. The 2003 LRDP EIR identified that campus development under the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of campus domestic/fire water extraction and conveyance systems, the construction of which would not cause significant environmental impacts (LRDP Impact 4.15-1). The domestic water line(s) associated with the project would be constructed within a previously disturbed area where cultural and biological resources would not likely occur. In addition, the campus would survey the site before construction and perform monitoring during construction (in compliance with 2003 LRDP Mitigations 4.4-1 and 4.5-1) to avoid inadvertent biological and cultural resource impacts. Therefore, effects associated with domestic water utility extensions would be less than significant. LRDP Mitigation 4.15-1(a-b), included in the proposed project, would further reduce the significance of this impact by requiring the water conservation strategies outlined in LRDP Mitigation 4.8-5(a) (see Hydrology and Water Quality section) and by requiring the campus to review the project to determine if the domestic/fire water supply is adequate at the point of connection and if any upgrades to the system are required. The utility study found that the domestic water supply has adequate capacity to support the project.
Utility Water Facilities

The existing utility water line on the east side of King Hall would need to be relocated further east because of the building addition. The 2003 LRDP EIR identified that campus development under the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of campus utility water extraction and conveyance systems, the construction of which would not cause significant environmental impacts (LRDP Impact 4.15-2). The utility water line associated with the project would be constructed within a previously disturbed area where cultural and biological resources would not likely occur. In addition, the campus would survey the site before construction and perform monitoring during construction (in compliance with 2003 LRDP Mitigations 4.4-1 and 4.5-1) to avoid inadvertent biological and cultural resource impacts. Therefore, effects associated with domestic water utility extensions would be less than significant. LRDP Mitigation 4.15-2(a-b), included in the proposed project, would further reduce the significance of this impact by requiring the water conservation strategies outlined in LRDP Mitigation 4.8-6(a) (see Hydrology and Water Quality section) and by requiring the campus to review the project to determine if the utility water supply is adequate at the point of connection and if any upgrades to the system are required. The utility study conducted for project planning purposes demonstrated that the utility water supply is adequate to support the project.

Wastewater Facilities

The proposed project would not increase the campus population. However, the project would add restrooms to the building, and could result in a slight increase in effluent. An existing 8" sanitary sewer line that crosses the southeast corner of the proposed addition would need to be relocated, and the project would repair the existing bike path and landscaping disturbed as a result. The 2003 LRDP EIR identified that implementation of the 2003 LRDP, including the proposed project, would require the expansion of campus wastewater treatment and conveyance facilities, the construction and operation of which would not result in significant environmental impacts (Impact 4.15-3). Future expansion of the existing WWTP and installation of new sanitary sewer conveyance lines would primarily occur on previously disturbed ground. In addition, the campus would survey the site before construction and perform monitoring during construction (in compliance with 2003 LRDP Mitigations 4.4-1 and 4.5-1) to avoid inadvertent biological and cultural resource impacts. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant. LRDP Mitigation 4.15-3, included in the proposed project, would further reduce the significance of this impact by ensuring the campus practice of reviewing projects to determine if there is adequate capacity to provide sanitary sewer service, and to upgrade the system as necessary. A utility study conducted for the purposes of planning the proposed project demonstrated adequate wastewater treatment plant capacity for the project.

c) Existing drain inlets at the northeast and southeast corners of the existing building would be relocated as a result of the proposed addition. The courtyard drainage system would require reconfiguration with the renovation. Rainwater planters and a bioswale are proposed to handle all new runoff generated by the building addition. The design intent of the bioswale would be to slow down and provide some pollutant filtration and soil percolation of runoff, before discharging remaining unpercolated runoff into the Arboretum Waterway. For this reason, the bioswale would likely be located on the east side of the project, leading to the Waterway. A storm drain connection to the Arboretum Waterway would be made for instances when the swale could not retain and infiltrate the amount of runoff typically associated with a 10-year storm event, the current campus standard for assessing storm drain capacity for a project. The project also proposes installing stormwater planters (essentially cisterns) to manage stormwater runoff. The 2003 LRDP EIR identified that implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of storm drainage conveyance and detention facilities, the construction and operation of which
would not result in significant environmental impacts (Impact 4.15-4). In addition, the campus would survey the site before construction and perform monitoring during construction (in compliance with 2003 LRDP Mitigations 4.4-1 and 4.5-1) to avoid inadvertent biological and cultural resource impacts. LRDP Mitigation 4.15-4, included in the proposed project, would further reduce this less-than-significant impact by ensuring the campus practice of reviewing projects to determine if there is adequate capacity to provide storm water drainage service for the proposed project, and to upgrade the system as necessary.

d) A utility study conducted for the proposed project estimated increased demand to rise from 110 gpm to 120 gpm. The proposed project would add fire sprinklers throughout the existing building to upgrade the facility to current code requirements. The project would impose minimal additional demand on the utility water system, which has adequate capacity to support the project. Impacts associated with the project’s demand for water from the deep and shallow/intermediate aquifers are addressed in item (b) in Section 7.8, Hydrology and Water Quality. As addressed, mitigation measures would be implemented under the 2003 LRDP to reduce the campus’ demand for domestic/fire and utility water, to monitor impacts on the groundwater aquifers, and to manage water sources if impacts on the aquifers are identified. However, regardless of mitigation, because the effects of increased groundwater extraction are not currently well understood, impacts of increased water use are considered significant and unavoidable (LRDP Impacts 4.8-5 and 4.8-6). These impacts were adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information has become available since certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR that would alter this previous analysis.

e) The campus’ WWTP would provide wastewater treatment for the proposed project. As discussed in item (b) above, LRDP Mitigation 4.15-3, included in the proposed project, would ensure the campus practice of reviewing projects to determine if there is adequate capacity to provide sanitary sewer service, and to upgrade the system as necessary. A utility study conducted for the purposes of planning the proposed project demonstrated adequate wastewater treatment plant capacity for the project. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

f) The waste disposal needs of the proposed project would be served by the campus landfill. Certain construction waste materials are recycled or salvaged as required by the campus’ standard construction contract specifications. The proposed project would not increase the campus population, therefore, little or no increase in waste generation and disposal is expected as a result of operating the project. As identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR, given the demands anticipated under the 2003 LRDP (including the proposed project), the life expectancy of the campus landfill is to 2023. Therefore, the campus landfill would have adequate capacity to serve the proposed project and the impact would be less than significant.

g) The proposed project is not anticipated to generate any atypical solid wastes. The proposed project would comply with all applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, no impact would occur.

h) The utility evaluation for the proposed project considered provision of electrical, chilled water, and steam service to the project.

**Electricity.** The existing 750KVA unit substation in the existing building basement is inadequate for the existing building. The proposed project would include upgrading the building substation and switchboard to a size adequate to handle the existing building and the new addition, including a new transformer (located outdoors, on the west side of the project site). A new fire
alarm system would be installed in the building to replace the existing system, which does not meet present day standards.

**Chilled Water/Steam.** The project would require upgrade of offsite chilled water and steam utility lines. These upgrades likely would not be completed before the building renovation and addition were completed and occupied. Consequently, the project design would include options to provide cooling and heating to the building on a stand-alone basis during the interim period between project completion and occupancy and the completion of the chilled water and steam pipeline upgrade. Each of the possible options would allow for connections to the campus chilled water and steam loops upon completion of those upgrades. The campus could connect King Hall to these central campus utilities as soon as the upgrades are completed; however, several of the proposed options could also provide long-term heating and cooling for the building. Interim heating and cooling systems solutions could include:

- Installing both an electric heating coil and a hot water heating coil in the new air handling unit for the new addition. The system could provide heat using electricity until the campus steam system is upgraded. At that time, the hot water coil would be connected to the hot water system and the electric coil would be inactive.

- Installing gas fired hot water boilers in the mechanical room and providing a hot water heating coil in the new air handler unit for the new addition. Once the campus steam system is upgraded, steam would be used to generate hot water and the boilers would be inactive. This option would require extending natural gas services to this facility along the west and north of the project site in the existing utility corridors and existing roadways.

- Installing a rooftop system for the new addition, containing both an air cooled refrigeration cycle and water cooling coil. Initially operate the system using the air cooled cycle for cooling. Once the campus chilled water system is upgraded, the chilled water coil would be activated and the air cooled system would be inactive.

- Providing a trailer mounted air cooled chilled water system or evaporative chiller next to the existing building to provide cooling for both the existing building and the new addition. This option could take up several parking spaces in Lot 3, north of the building.

- Using water source heat pumps in the new addition utilizing geothermal (ground source) as the heat sink to supply both heating and cooling. The heat pumps could either be unitary type or larger central systems and could also generate hot and chilled water for the existing building. This would be a permanent installation and allow the building to operate without the use of campus chilled water or steam. This option would require the use of natural gas or electricity to supplement the heating component. The campus electrical system has sufficient capacity to support the use of electricity. The campus would need to extend a connection from the building to the natural gas system, if natural gas were to be used to provide supplemental heating.

The 2003 LRDP EIR identified that growth under the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of the campus chilled water system, and campus steam system (LRDP Impact 4.15-8). The new chilled water and steam utility extensions required by the proposed project mainly would run to the west, along California Avenue, and north of the project site, and would be constructed in existing utility corridors and existing roadways. In addition, the campus would survey the site before construction and perform monitoring during construction (in compliance with 2003 LRDP Mitigations 4.4-1 and 4.5-1) to avoid inadvertent biological and cultural resource impacts. Therefore, environmental effects associated with utility extensions would be less than significant. LRDP Mitigations 4.15-6(a-b) and 4.15-8, included in the proposed project, would further reduce the significance of these impacts by requiring the campus to continue to incorporate energy efficient design elements, meet or exceed Title 24 energy conservation requirements, and review
the project to determine if the relevant utility supply is adequate at the point of connection and if any upgrades to the utility system are required. The Regent’s Policy on Green Building Design and Clean Energy Standards, adopted July 17, 2003, set a goal for all new building projects, other than acute-care facilities, approved after the 2004-05 fiscal year, to outperform the required provisions of the California Energy Code (Title 24) energy-efficiency standards by at least 20 percent.

i) The 2003 LRDP EIR identified that growth under the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of the campus telecommunications system, which would not result in significant environmental impacts (LRDP Impact 4.15-9). LRDP Mitigation 4.15-9, included in the proposed project, would further reduce the significance of this impact by requiring the campus to determine if the telecommunication capacity is adequate at the point of connection and if any upgrades to the system are required. The utility evaluation for the proposed project considered provision of telecommunications service to the project. Additional service would be provided to the building via existing conduit; no upgrades to the campus telecommunications system would be required. Therefore, environmental effects associated with utility extensions would be less than significant.

Summary

Mitigation measures 4.15-1(a-b), 4.15-2(a-b), 4.15-3, 4.15-4, 4.15-6(a-b), 4.15-8, and 4.15-9 from the 2003 LRDP EIR are relevant to the proposed project and reduce the significance of utility and service system impacts to the extent feasible. The proposed project would not exceed the levels of significance of utility and service system impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant impacts that were not previously addressed.
7.17 Mandatory Findings of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandatory Findings of Significance</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Impact for which 2003 LRDP EIR is Sufficient</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project…

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a 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 a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

[ ] [ ] [✓] [ ] [ ]

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)?

[ ] [ ] [✓] [ ] [ ]

c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

[ ] [ ] [✓] [ ] [ ]

a) The proposed project would not significantly affect fish or wildlife habitat, nor would it eliminate examples of California history or prehistory. Cumulative regional impacts could be significant, but mitigation measures to reduce these potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant levels are not available or are not within the jurisdiction of the University of California to enforce and monitor. These impacts were adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information has become available since certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR that would alter this previous analysis.

b,c) The proposed project would not contribute to significant unavoidable impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR related to: agriculture resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/circulation, and utilities and service systems. It would incrementally contribute to, but would not exceed, significant and unavoidable impacts related to: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, and hydrology and water quality. These impacts were adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and fully addressed in the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information has become available since certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR that would alter this previous analysis.
8 FISH & GAME DETERMINATION

Based on the information presented in this Tiered Initial Study, the project has a potential to adversely affect wildlife or the habitat upon which wildlife depend. Therefore, a filing fee will be paid.

___ Certificate of Fee Exemption

__X__ Pay Fee
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NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Lead Agency: University of California

Project Proponent: University of California, Davis

Project Location: Yolo County, UC Davis, on Mrak Hall Drive in the southeastern quadrant of the central campus

Project Description: The King Hall Renovation and Expansion project would renovate and expand the existing Martin Luther King Jr. Law School building, located south of Parking Lot 3, east of Mrak Hall Drive, and north of the Arboretum. The renovation would remodel approximately 20,870 gross square feet of existing space, and the new addition would provide approximately 29,795 gross square feet on the eastern side of the existing building.

Mitigation Measure: No project-specific mitigation measures are required in addition to relevant mitigation measures from the 2003 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report.

Reference: This Negative Declaration incorporates by reference in their entirety the text of the Tiered Initial Study prepared for the project, the 2003 LRDP, and the 2003 LRDP EIR.

Determination: In accordance with CEQA, a Draft Tiered Initial Study has been prepared by UC Davis that evaluates the environmental effects of the proposed project. On the basis of the project's Draft Tiered Initial Study the campus found that the proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment that has not been previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR.

Public Review: In accordance with Section 15073 of the CEQA Guidelines, the Draft Tiered Initial Study for the project was circulated for public and agency review from September 8, 2006 to October 9, 2006. Comments received during the review period and responses to these comments are presented in Appendix B of this final Tiered Initial Study.
APPENDIX B
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COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

On September 8, 2006, UC Davis circulated for public review a Negative Declaration (ND) for the King Hall Renovation and Expansion Project (the “project”). As required by Section 15073 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the ND was circulated for 30 days, until October 9, 2006. UC Davis received three comments on the ND. Section 15074(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires the decision-making body to consider the ND and comments thereto prior to considering the project for approval. Responses to comments are not required by CEQA, although responses may be provided at the discretion of the lead agency. UC Davis has provided responses to comments below.

Three comments were received during the public review period from the following agencies and members of the public:

Comment 1: California Department of Water Resources

Comment 2: Lisa Wing

Comment 3: Jerry Johnson

These comments and the responses to the comments are provided on the following pages.
September 25, 2006

Sid England  
University of California  
Office of Resource Management and Planning, UC Davis  
Davis, California 95616

King Hall Renovation and Expansion  
State Clearinghouse (SCH) Number: 2006092036

The project corresponding to the subject SCH identification number has come to our attention. The limited project description suggests a potential encroachment on the State Adopted Plan of Flood Control. If indeed your project encroaches on an adopted flood control plan, you will need to obtain an encroachment permit from the Reclamation Board prior to initiating any activities. The attached Fact Sheet explains the permitting process. Please note that the permitting process may take as much as 45 to 60 days to process. Also note that a condition of the permit requires the securing all of the appropriate additional permits before initiating work. This information is provided so that you may plan accordingly.

If after careful evaluation, it is your assessment that your project is not within the authority of the Reclamation Board, you may disregard this notice. For further information, please contact Sam Brandon of my staff at (916) 574-0651.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mike Mirmazaheri, Chief  
Floodway Protection Section

cc: Governor's Office of Planning and Research  
State Clearinghouse  
1400 Tenth Street, Room 121  
Sacramento, CA 95814
Encroachment Permits Fact Sheet

Basis for Authority
State law (Water Code Sections 8534, 8608, 8609, and 8710 – 8723) tasks the Reclamation Board with enforcing appropriate standards for the construction, maintenance, and protection of adopted flood control plans. Regulations implementing these directives are found in California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 23, Division 1.

Area of Reclamation Board Jurisdiction
The adopted plan of flood control under the jurisdiction and authority of the Reclamation Board includes the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and their tributaries and distributaries and the designated floodways.

Streams regulated by the Reclamation Board can be found in Title 23 Section 112. Information on designated floodways can be found on the Reclamation Board’s website at [http://recbd.ca.gov/designated_floodway/](http://recbd.ca.gov/designated_floodway/) and CCR Title 23 Sections 101 - 107.

Regulatory Process
The Reclamation Board ensures the integrity of the flood control system through a permit process (Water Code Section 8710). A permit must be obtained prior to initiating any activity, including excavation and construction, removal or planting of landscaping within floodways, levees, and 10 feet landward of the landside levee toes. Additionally, activities located outside of the adopted plan of flood control but which may foreseeable interfere with the functioning or operation of the plan of flood control is also subject to a permit of the Reclamation Board.

Details regarding the permitting process and the regulations can be found on the Reclamation Board’s website at [http://recbd.ca.gov/](http://recbd.ca.gov/) under “Frequently Asked Questions” and “Regulations,” respectively. The application form and the accompanying environmental questionnaire can be found on the Reclamation Board’s website at [http://recbd.ca.gov/forms.cfm](http://recbd.ca.gov/forms.cfm).

Application Review Process
Applications when deemed complete will undergo technical and environmental review by Reclamation Board and/or Department of Water Resources staff.

Technical Review
A technical review is conducted of the application to ensure consistency with the regulatory standards designed to ensure the function and structural integrity of the adopted plan of flood control for the protection of public welfare and safety. Standards and permitted uses of designated floodways are found in CCR Title 23 Sections 107 and Article 8 (Sections 111 to 137). The permit contains 12 standard conditions and additional special conditions may be placed on the permit as the situation warrants. Special conditions, for example, may include mitigation for the hydraulic impacts of the project by reducing or eliminating the additional flood risk to third parties that may caused by the project.

Additional information may be requested in support of the technical review of
your application pursuant to CCR Title 23 Section 8(b)(4). This information may include but not limited to geotechnical exploration, soil testing, hydraulic or sediment transport studies, and other analyses may be required at any time prior to a determination on the application.

Environmental Review
A determination on an encroachment application is a discretionary action by the Reclamation Board and its staff and subject to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code 21000 et seq.). Additional environmental considerations are placed on the issuance of the encroachment permit by Water Code Section 8608 and the corresponding implementing regulations (California Code of Regulations – CCR Title 23 Sections 10 and 16).

In most cases, the Reclamation Board will be assuming the role of a “responsible agency” within the meaning of CEQA. In these situations, the application must include a certified CEQA document by the “lead agency” [CCR Title 23 Section 8(b)(2)]. We emphasize that such a document must include within its project description and environmental assessment of the activities for which are being considered under the permit.

Encroachment applications will also undergo a review by an interagency Environmental Review Committee (ERC) pursuant to CCR Title 23 Section 10. Review of your application will be facilitated by providing as much additional environmental information as pertinent and available to the applicant at the time of submission of the encroachment application.

These additional documentations may include the following documentation:

- California Department of Fish and Game Streambed Alteration Notification (http://www.dfg.ca.gov/1600/),
- Clean Water Act Section 404 applications, and Rivers and Harbors Section 10 application (US Army Corp of Engineers),
- Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification, and
- corresponding determinations by the respective regulatory agencies to the aforementioned applications, including Biological Opinions, if available at the time of submission of your application.

The submission of this information, if pertinent to your application, will expedite review and prevent overlapping requirements. This information should be made available as a supplement to your application as it becomes available. Transmittal information should reference the application number provided by the Reclamation Board.

In some limited situations, such as for minor projects, there may be no other agency with approval authority over the project, other than the encroachment permit by Reclamation Board. In these limited instances, the Reclamation Board
may choose to serve as the "lead agency" within the meaning of CEQA and in most cases the projects are of such a nature that a categorical or statutory exemption will apply. The Reclamation Board cannot invest staff resources to prepare complex environmental documentation.

Additional information may be requested in support of the environmental review of your application pursuant to CCR Title 23 Section 8(b)(4). This information may include biological surveys or other environmental surveys and may be required at anytime prior to a determination on the application.
Response to Comment 1
California Department of Water Resources
Floodway Protection Section

1 Comment noted. The proposed renovation and addition to King Hall is 17 feet above the Arboretum Waterway, is outside the 100-year flood plain, and would not encroach on the State Adopted Plan of Flood Control. The project does include a possible reconfiguration of the stormwater inlets to the Arboretum Waterway. As may be necessary to reconfigure these inlets, the campus will apply for and obtain all necessary permits.
Camille Kirk

From: Lisa Wing
To: UC Davis Environmental Review
Subject: See No Evil/Hear No Evil Sculptures

The relocation of the "See No Evil/Hear No Evil" eggheads to the Mrak Hall Drive Circle would change the implication of Robert Arneson's sculpture. The eggheads are both talking, but not listening (no ears). Currently it refers to lawyers, as implied by its location next to the Law School. If moved to Mrak Circle, it would refer to the UC Davis Administration. Perhaps you may want to keep the sculpture adjacent to the Law School. . . .

Respectfully,
Lisa Wing
Camille Kirk

From: Jerry L Johnson
To: UC Davis Environmental Review
Subject: King Hall Project

Folks,

Is it really necessary to move the Eggheads so far away from the Law School? I would think it significantly decrease the artistic value. If the Law faculty can't stand a little joke, maybe they should grow up & get a life. I think every effort should be made to keep the Eggheads as close to the Law School as possible. If it perceived as a negative, maybe they should try and turn it around as if to say "Yes, that may be most lawyers, but we're different".

Give me a break, lighten up.

Thanks,

Jerry Johnson
Both comments express concern about changing the meaning of the Arneson sculptures due
to their proposed relocation approximately 150 feet to the east of their current location. As
noted on pages 15 and 31 of the Negative Declaration, the proposed relocation site for the
Arneson sculptures is to Mrak Hall Circle, in front of the Law School to preserve the intent of
the artist. The design for the relocation of the sculptures makes every effort to respect the
intent of the original installation and to uphold the meaning of the art piece, including the
orientation, mound shape, and placement of the sculptures. Therefore, the concern of the
commenters has been addressed.