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1 PROJECT INFORMATION

Project title:

Segundo Services Center

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 will guide 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
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 in 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 project consistency with applicable land use controls, and name of persons who prepared initial study.

2.2 TIERING PROCESS

This environmental analysis is a Tiered Initial Study for the proposed Segundo Services Center (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 will guide 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 a 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 form 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 required. 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 Proposed 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. Those 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures that are related to, and may reduce the impacts of, this project are identified in this Initial Study. The corresponding references to the LRDP Mitigation Monitoring Program also is provided. 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 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.

Since none of the conditions described in CEQA or the CEQA Guidelines calling for preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR have occurred, 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.
2.3 PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW

This Draft Tiered Initial Study will be circulated for public and agency review from December 13, 2004 to January 11, 2005. Copies of this document, the 2003 LRDP, and the 2003 LRDP 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/

Comments on this Draft Tiered Initial Study must be received by 5 PM on January 11, 2005 and can be e-mailed to environreview@ucdavis.edu or sent to:

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

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 Spring, 2005.

2.1 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 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 and relevant impacts and mitigation measures from the 2003 LRDP EIR, and an explanation of all checklist answers.

Section 8 – References: lists references used in the preparation of this document.

Section 9 – Agencies and Persons Consulted: provides the names of individuals contacted in preparation of this document.

Section 10 – Report Preparers: lists the names of individuals involved in the preparation of this document.

Appendix A – Proposed Negative Declaration: presents the Proposed Negative Declaration for the project.
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 1). The campus consists of four general 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 approximately 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.

3.2 PROJECT OVERVIEW
UC Davis proposes to redevelop approximately two acres within the Segundo Housing District for the Segundo Services Center Redevelopment Project (the project). The proposed redevelopment project includes the demolition of the existing dining commons building, removal of a temporary food service building, construction of a new community services building, and landscape enhancements to create a formal quad area on the east side of the new building. The new community services building would be called the Segundo Services Center and would contain approximately 25,000 assignable square feet (asf) (approximately 32,000 gross square feet (gsf)). The project site is within the center of the Segundo Housing District which is a dormitory-style housing area of approximately 10 acres located south of Russell Boulevard and east of La Rue Road on the UC Davis core campus (Figure 2). Development within the Segundo Housing District includes large-scale dormitory buildings for approximately 1,600 students, the existing dining commons building, a new dining commons replacement building that is currently under construction, and combined pedestrian/bicycle paths to connect the buildings and activities within the housing district. Upon completion of the new dining commons building, the existing dining commons building will no longer be needed to serve the Segundo residents. The existing single-story building would need extensive upgrades and retrofitting of major service systems in order to be reused for a different use and these modifications would not be cost effective on a per square foot basis.

The proposed Segundo Services Center will provide the services needed within the Segundo Housing District in a modern two-story building that will more efficiently utilize the available land area. The use of a more efficient two-story replacement building will allow installation of a centralized formal quad area to serve as a new outdoor living space for the area residents. The project site includes a portion of existing Parking Lot 24, and will result in the loss of approximately 25 parking spaces from Parking Lot 24.
Figure 1
Regional Location
Figure 3
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Figure 4: Conceptual Site Plan
Segundo Services Center
3.3 PROJECT SITE

The Segundo Services Center project site is a two-acre area within the center of the approximately 10-acre Segundo Housing District. The 2003 LRDP designates the area for housing uses, and the proposed uses within the Segundo Services Center are consistent with the uses allowed in the 2003 LRDP housing land use designation. The entire Segundo Housing District is bounded by Russell Boulevard on the north, La Rue Road on the west, a major east-west bicycle path and Parking Lot 25 on the south, and additional student housing areas to the east. The Segundo Services Center site sits in the middle of the Segundo District and is a rectangular shaped area oriented in an east-west direction and bounded on the north and south by mid-rise residence halls built in the 1960’s. Current development at the project site consists of a lawn and path area at the east, a temporary food service building, the existing Segundo Dining Commons, and Parking Lot 24 which provides parking for 55 automobiles at the west end of the project site. Demolition of the obsolete Dining Commons and removal of the temporary food service building will create an open area of sufficient size to accommodate the new Segundo Services Center and a new open space quad area. The new quad is planned for the east side of the project site, and the Segundo Services Center is planned for the west side of the project site. The Segundo Services Center will serve as the focus of student activities and daily functions within the Segundo District, and the new quad area will serve as the primary outdoor living space for the residents of the Segundo District.

The current landscape plan around the residence halls is comprised of undulating berms and meandering paths. Large scale pine trees are visually majestic and help to provide a scale to the large residence halls. The campus conducted a tree survey of the project site and two trees were rated as “specimen” trees that are of high value to the campus. Both of these trees would be preserved as part of the site planning process for the proposed Segundo Services Center. The specimen trees included a large Hackberry tree in the central Dining Commons courtyard and a Ginko Biloba tree on the north side of the existing Dining Commons. The two trees were identified on the campus tree evaluation as important trees to preserve during site planning and these trees will not be removed. The tree survey process is further described in Section 7.4.

3.4 PROJECT NEED AND OBJECTIVES

The proposed project would provide the space required to serve Segundo residents with community and academic services in a single location. Additional centralized space is needed to serve residents with these services efficiently. Such a space is not available at this time due to the increased size of the resident population since the completion of the Segundo housing expansion project. The project would also enhance the sense of community and aesthetic appeal of the Segundo Housing District by providing a formal quad area with landscaping, paths, and lighting to reflect the changed area circulation patterns. Objectives of the project include the following:

- Establish the Segundo Services Center as the community center for the Segundo Housing District.
- Provide a unique identity for the Segundo area
• Support multiple functions to meet the needs of Segundo residents and housing employees.
• Appealing design for site enhancement and building identity.
• Ease of maintenance to support appearance improvements and labor efficiency.
• Pedestrian safety and support to facilitate and encourage late night activities
• Landscaping planting for long-term health and visual balance.

3.5 PROJECT ELEMENTS

3.5.1 Buildings

The Segundo Services Center will be a two-story building with approximately 25,000 asf (32,000 gsf). Space within the building will consist of the following types and sizes:

Academic Advising Center (2,475 asf). The Academic Advising Center is one of the core ancillary services offered by Student Housing. The Center provides academic tutoring and advising for all the students in the Segundo District to help them adjust to and master the academic rigors of college life. The program is highly successful and widely used. It functions as a walk-in center where counselors provide advising and facilitate tutoring by faculty and peers.

Area Service Desk (910 asf). The Area Service Desk functions as the main information desk for the building. It will be used throughout the school year by the students and during the summer months by the conference housing guests. Typically the Area Service Desk is staffed by students, overseen by the housing staff. The Area Service Desk is where students pick up oversized mail, check out games, get help with lost keys and get general information.

Conference Housing (865 asf). Conference Housing is the division of Housing that organizes and runs the leasing of the student residence halls and related facilities during the summer months when the students are away for summer break. The Conference Housing offices need to have a separate entrance on the west side of the building so that non-University clients can enter from La Rue.

Food Service (7,900 asf). The proposed Segundo Services Center would include two food service functions. The first is the student related services composed of the convenience store. The second is the campus food service provider’s (currently Sodexho) central office and support spaces. The student concessions will be located on the ground floor.

General Building Space (7,370 asf). General building space will include restrooms, the lobby, conference rooms, staff break room, maintenance space, storage space, custodial space, and office space.

Learning Resource Center (1,620 asf). The Learning Resource Center is a walk-in computer lab that the students use for individual and small group work. The Learning Resource staff provides software support and runs computer application tutorials for small and large groups.
Media Resource Center (1,010 asf). The Media Resource Center provides the cable TV for all the
dorm rooms and TV’s throughout the housing districts. The Media Resource Center will be located
on the second floor.

Recreation Area and Laundry (2,500 asf). The Recreation Area and Laundry facility will consist
of a coffee shop, game area, and laundry facility.

3.5.2 Landscaping

The Segundo Services Center will be the focal point of the new quad. The east face of the
building and the entry plaza will be illuminated more than the general landscape to emphasize
the primary importance of the building to Segundo residents.

3.5.3 Parking and Roadways

No roadways will be affected by the proposed project. Vehicular access to the project site is
provided by La Rue Road. Parking Lot 24 will be reconfigured and partially removed to
accommodate the proposed building. The parking capacity in Parking Lot 24 will decrease from
61 space to approximately 10 spaces.

3.5.4 Utilities and Infrastructure

As discussed briefly below and analyzed in Section 4.15, the proposed project would require
connections to campus utilities and infrastructure including domestic water, utility water, sanitary
sewer, storm drain, steam, natural gas, electric, chilled water, and telecommunications.

- Domestic Water: Domestic water (for building potable water and fire sprinklers) service
  will be provided to the proposed building from the existing six-inch domestic water main
  running along the south side of the existing dining commons building. The main
  terminates at the southwest corner of the dining commons where the new service can
  connect to and extend to the proposed building.

- Utility Water: Utility water (for irrigation use only) service will be provided to the
  proposed building from the six-inch utility water main running along the north side of the
  existing dining commons building.

- Sanitary Sewer: Sanitary sewer service will be provided from the existing 10-inch sanitary
  sewer main located in La Rue Road or the existing eight inch sanitary sewer main located
  north of the new building. The service lateral to the building shall be at least six inches to
  provide acceptable service.

- Storm Drainage: Site storm drainage shall be connected to the existing storm drain lines
  located on the north or south of the site or to the west (within the existing parking lot).
  Roof drains will be piped directly into the storm drain system.
• Electricity: There is an existing electrical transformer located in the service yard of the dining commons building. This transformer serves the existing dining commons and the four high rise dormitories surrounding the site. It is located within the proposed building footprint and will need to be replaced with a new transformer located outside the proposed footprint of the building. The existing services will need to be rerouted to the new transformer and connected before the old transformer can be removed. Service to the new building shall come from this new transformer. The preliminary building demand indicates that the new transformer will be required to serve a load of 500 kVA.

• Natural Gas: The natural gas service will connect to the existing 2.5-inch natural gas main running along the south side of the existing dining commons building.

• Chilled Water: The chilled water service and return will be connected to the existing chilled water/chilled water return stubs located southeast of the project site, between Gilmore and Bixby Halls. The service shall consist of pipe and return pipes extending from the existing stubs to the proposed building.

• Steam: The steam and steam condensate return services will be connected to the existing steam and condensate return mains located just east of Gilmore Hall. A new underground vault for the steam system connections shall be constructed within the new building’s mechanical room or within 50 feet of the building.

• Telecommunications: The telecommunications service will be connected to the existing telecommunications vault located just east of Gilmore Hall.

3.5.5 Sustainable Design Elements

The proposed project would comply with the UC-wide green building policy and clean energy standard by achieving the following: equivalent of LEED “Certified” rating focusing on the following design elements:

• Site plan and orient building to maximize natural ventilation and day lighting opportunities.
• Design building and site surfaces not to retain heat.
• Reduce mechanical loads by designing building envelope to be responsive to site conditions—providing external sunshades, high-efficiency glazing, efficient lighting systems and controls, operable windows for offices.
• Select materials that promote healthy indoor air quality.
• Select wood material from certified forests and use FSC certified wood products.
• Use material that has high recycled content and that are recyclable at the end of life.
• Reduce water use by incorporating high efficiency fixtures and capturing condensation from mechanical systems.
• Design landscape to reduce irrigation use by utilizing a plant palette that includes native plants and drought-tolerant species.
• Develop an aggressive construction waste management plan to divert more than 80% of construction waste away from landfills and into salvage or recycle facilities.

3.5.6 Population

The Segundo Services Center project is not expected to result in a net increase to the campus population of students or employees. The building would serve the existing students within the Segundo Housing District and would not result in any increase to the student population. The proposed Segundo Services Center building would be the primary workplace for approximately 37 employees. The existing dining commons building that will be demolished as part of the proposed project is the primary workplace for approximately half of these employees and the remaining employees would relocate from the central housing office and other similarly overcrowded areas on-campus. The central housing office is currently overcrowded in terms of the work space available for employees and by moving staff out of the building, more efficient working conditions are expected. Accordingly, no increase to the campus population is expected from the proposed project.

3.6 Construction Schedule and Staging

Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to begin in Fall 2005 and end in Fall 2006. Construction staging and contractor parking associated with the proposed project would occur on the project site including parts or all of Parking Lot 24.
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 2003 LRDP identifies housing on the campus as a priority and designates land currently used for housing and land for future housing development. The proposed project would take place on land currently used for housing purposes and would support the existing level of housing rather than resulting in an increase in the total amount of campus housing. Accordingly, the project would not exceed the amount of housing forecast in the 2003 LRDP and would not exceed the scope of development analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR.

4.2 2003 LRDP LAND USE DESIGNATION

The proposed project would be located on land identified in the 2003 LRDP as Housing. The proposed building would be used to support housing functions within the Segundo Housing District and would be consistent with the uses identified for the Housing land use.

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 employees1. 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 would introduce no new students and no new members of the faculty and staff population. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with 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 support these main 2003 LRDP objectives by redeveloping and enhancing the core campus housing that is available for UC Davis students. Providing campus housing helps to enrich campus life by ensuring that students are able to spend more time on-campus participating in student campus life rather than spending increased time commuting from an off-campus location. Redeveloping a site helps in the efficient management of campus lands to ensure that campus facilities are in close proximity to each other.

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

**Community Spaces:** Include physical spaces in residential areas that foster a sense of community [LRDP Chapter IV, page 66].

The proposed project is a redevelopment project that would create a new community services building in the Segundo Housing District and a new landscaped quad area adjacent to the

---

1 The on-campus population includes students and employees on the UC Davis main campus and at other University owned and operated facilities in the City of Davis. The campus population is determined based on headcount, a method of counting faculty, staff, and students in which each person is counted as one unit regardless of whether he or she is employed or studying full-time or part-time. Student population figures represent student headcount averaged over the primary three academic quarters (i.e., fall, winter, spring).
community services building. These physical improvements would create two community spaces for the Segundo residents that would enhance the social interaction and aesthetic appeal of the Segundo area.

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 (or would not) 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); degradation of visual character or quality (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); 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); increased water extraction from the shallow/intermediate aquifers (Section 7.8); 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: increases in light and glare (Section 7.1) and increases in criteria pollutant emissions (Section 7.3).

- The proposed project would not incrementally contribute to any of the less-than-significant cumulative impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR.
5 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving 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. The proposed Negative Declaration is included 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 will be prepared and a proposed Negative Declaration is included 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, 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 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.

- **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 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. This conclusion may also be appropriate where the particular impact and associated mitigation measures are sufficiently generic so that no further analysis is necessary or appropriate (i.e., the LRDP EIR contains all of the analysis that reasonably could be included on the topic with respect to all projects generally, including the specific project under analysis), and where no additional mitigation is feasible.
• **Less than Significant Impact:** An effect for which no significant impacts, only less than significant impacts, will result.

• **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 takes place for every major capital project by the campus Design Review Committee, which 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 proposed Segundo Services Center project sits in the middle of the Segundo District and is a rectangular shaped area oriented in an east-west direction and bounded on the north and south by mid-rise residence halls built in the 1960’s. For the public, the site is visible from La Rue Road by looking east across the existing Parking Lot 24. For people within the Segundo Housing District, the site is visible from many different points because many of the bike and pedestrian paths lead to and from the site. The existing view from La Rue across Parking Lot 24 is dominated by the loading dock area for the Segundo Dining Commons building that will be removed to accommodate the new Segundo Services Center building.

Current development at the project site consists of the lawn and path area at the east, a temporary food service building, the obsolete Segundo Dining Commons (a single-story building with cement and brick exterior finishing), and Parking Lot 24 at the west end of the project site. Demolition of the Dining Commons and removal of the temporary food service building will create an open area of sufficient size to accommodate the new Segundo Services Center and a new open space quad area. The new quad is planned for the east side of the project site and the Segundo Services Center is planned for the west side of the project site. The current landscaping around the base of the residence halls is comprised of undulating berms and meandering paths. Large scale pine trees are visually majestic and help to provide a scale to the large residence halls. The current plan is casual in nature and focuses attention on the central Dining Commons building. Additional significant trees include a large Hackberry in the central Dining Commons courtyard and other major Hackberry trees scattered on 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. A mitigation measure is included to reduce the magnitude of cumulative impact 4.1-6 but this impact is identified as significant and unavoidable because the feasibility and/or implementation of mitigation fall within the responsibility of other jurisdictions and therefore can not 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>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>4.1-6 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 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>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1-3(a) Design for specific projects shall provide for the use of textured nonreflective exterior surfaces and nonreflective glass.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

Aesthetics

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.

4.1-6(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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aesthetics</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) 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) A scenic vista is defined as an expansive view of a highly valued landscape from a publicly accessible viewpoint. 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 proposed project is within a developed portion of the campus and with no open views toward the west and accordingly, it will have no effect on 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 proposed project would not conflict with any of these visual elements. No impact would occur.

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 project would include indoor and outdoor lighting that would increase the nighttime lighting on the project site. In compliance with LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(a), the project would use textured nonreflective exterior surfaces and nonreflective glass to minimize glare. 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 cases 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 level.

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 region (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, 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 Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information is available since certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR that would alter this previous analysis.

Summary

Mitigation Measures 4.1-3 (a-d) and 4.1-6 (a-b) from the 2003 LRDP EIR are being utilized by the proposed project to 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.

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. None of the significant agricultural impact identified in the 2003 LRDP are relevant to the proposed project and none of the mitigation measures in the 2003 LRDP EIR are applicable to the proposed project.

The proposed project is evaluated in the checklist and discussion below.

### 7.2.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Agricultural Resources</strong></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) 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 identified as Urban and Built Up Land under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Furthermore, construction of the project would be in an area previously developed for academic uses. The project would not contribute to LRDP Impact 4.2-4, which addresses the cumulative loss of designated farmland.

b) Campus lands are not subject to local zoning control and are not eligible for Williamson Act agreements due to the University’s tax exempt status. The project site is identified as Urban and Built-Up Land under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program and is designated under the 2003 LRDP for Academic/Administrative High Density use. 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 project would not involve any other changes that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.
Summary

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), and lead (Pb). In addition, particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM₂.₅) is a criteria pollutant. 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 \( O_3 \) and \( \text{PM}_{10} \). The designation of
an area as attainment and nonattainment is based on monitored data throughout the SVAB.

**Project Site**

Sensitive receptors at the project site are the adjacent residence halls. No existing air pollutant
sources exist at the project site.

### 7.3.2 2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance

The 2003 LRDP EIR considered 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 NO\(_x\) and
ROG in excess of 82 pounds a day, CO emissions in excess of 550 pounds a
day, and 150 pounds a day for \( \text{PM}_{10} \) 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 noncarcinogenic (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 included to
reduce the magnitude of project-level impact 4.3-1, 4.3-3 and cumulative impact 4.3-6, 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>4.3-1 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>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<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>
</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 implementing the 2003 LRDP, they are not 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 the 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures.

<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>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3-1(b) Area Sources. The following measures will be implemented to reduce emissions from area sources, as feasible.
   - Use solar or low-emission water heaters in new or renovated buildings.
   - Orient buildings to take advantage of solar heating and natural cooling and use passive solar designs.
   - Increase wall and attic insulation in new or renovated buildings.
   - For fireplaces or wood-burning appliances, require low-emitting EPA certified wood-burning appliances, or residential natural-gas fireplaces.
   - Provide electric equipment for landscape maintenance.

4.3-1(c) The campus will work with the YSAQMD to ensure that emissions directly and indirectly associated with the campus are adequately accounted for and mitigated in applicable air quality planning efforts. The YSAQMD can and should adopt adequate measures consistent with applicable law to ensure that air quality standard violations are avoided.

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).

### 7.3.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air 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) 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>
**Construction**

The 2003 LRDP EIR found that construction activities under the 2003 LRDP could exceed YSAQMD thresholds (LRDP Impact 4.3-3). Construction under the proposed project would be limited to the approximately 2-acre site but would involve ground disturbance for foundation excavation, utility installation, and final grading. Construction equipment and building materials that emit air pollutants would further contribute to air emissions during construction. Because potential construction emissions from campus projects could exceed the YSAQMD thresholds, this impact was identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR as significant and LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.3-3 (a-c) continues to be implemented to help reduce the impact. As described in the 2003 LRDP EIR, even though the mitigation measure would help reduce construction related emissions, multiple construction projects at UC Davis could produce sufficient emissions to exceed the YSAQMD threshold of significance; therefore, and accordingly, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

**Operation**

**Criteria Pollutants**

The proposed project would result in no increase to the campus population and would not increase the amount or the length of vehicle trips conducted by the existing campus population. There are no stationary source emissions of criteria pollutants associated with the proposed project. No impact would occur.

**Toxic Air Contaminants**

The project would provide community space to serve the adjacent residence halls for the existing population level of students and for the existing population of staff. The proposed project is not expected to result in increased vehicular use. The building would not include lab space and would not emit toxic air contaminants. No impact would occur.

**Cumulative Development**

The 2003 LRDP EIR finds 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, which is being utilized by 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 Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in
connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information is available since certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR that would alter this previous analysis.

e) The 2003 LRDP EIR concluded that odor impacts associated with development under the 2003 LRDP would be less than significant. The proposed project would not create any additional sources of odor and there would be no impact.

Summary

LRDP Mitigations 4.3-1(a-c), 4.3-3(a-c), and 4.3-6 are relevant to the proposed project to 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 a highly developed, urbanized area surrounded by large scale, multi-story buildings that provide housing for approximately 1,600 college students. The site contains no valley elderberry shrubs. Because of the highly developed conditions, no potential special status species are expected on the project site and a biological site survey was not conducted for the site.

A tree survey was conducted of the project site in accordance with the campus practice for identifying trees to preserve during a development or redevelopment project. The tree survey rated two trees as “specimen” trees that are of high value to the campus. Both of these trees would be preserved as part of the site planning process for the proposed Segundo Services Center. The specimen trees included a large Hackberry tree in the central Dining Commons.
courtyard and a Ginko Biloba tree on the north side of the existing Dining Commons. The two trees were identified on the campus tree evaluation as specimen trees to preserve during site planning and these trees will not be removed.

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 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.
### 2003 LRDP EIR Impacts

#### Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.4-11</th>
<th>Development under the 2003 LRDP could result in the removal of trees recognized to meet the campus’ standards for important trees, including:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Heritage Trees: Healthy valley oak trees with trunk diameters of 33 inches or greater at a height of 54 inches from the ground.</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Specimen Trees: Healthy trees or stands of trees that are of high value to the campus due to their size, species, extraordinary educational and research value, and/or other exceptional local importance.</td>
<td>a. 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 and that will be required as part of project implementation 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. The benefits of these mitigation measures will be achieved independently of considering them 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.4-11</th>
<th>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:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project is evaluated in the checklist and discussion below.
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 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) A review of the project site and surrounding areas indicates that the highly developed and consistent activity levels near the project site preclude the existence of sensitive plant or animal species in the project area. No impacts are expected from the redevelopment project.

b,c) The proposed project would not affect any wetlands as none are present at the project site.

d) The Putah Creek corridor 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 two miles from this corridor. Therefore, the project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. No impact would occur.

e) Pursuant to mitigation in the 2003 LRDP, the campus adheres to a tree protection plan. In accordance LRDP Mitigation 4.4-11, the campus has performed a tree survey of the project site. The tree survey indicated that no heritage trees would be affected by project construction. The tree survey did identify two trees (the Chinese hackberry in the courtyard of the existing dining commons and a ginko biloba tree on the north side of the dining commons) with a ranking of “specimen tree,” indicating that the site planning process should preserve these trees. The current plan for the Segundo Services Center would preserve these trees and the effect on these trees 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 VELB at Russell Ranch. The proposed project is not located at Russell Ranch. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with an adopted HCP or NCCP.

Summary

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

The campus is currently undertaking a site survey for potential buried cultural resources at the project site. The results of the survey will be incorporated into the Final Initial Study. The outcome of the survey is expected to be negative because of the extensive soil disturbance during previous building construction, infrastructure installation, and landscaping projects. In addition all previous subsurface testing on this part of the campus has had negative results. The buildings at the project site are less than 50 years old.
7.5.2 2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance

The following archaeological and historical standards of significance were 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), as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, 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.

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 (d) and (e) 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 Initial Study, pursuant to PRC § 21083.2 the impacts of the proposed project on an historical resource would be considered significant if they 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. 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”. Generally, under the provisions of CEQA Guideline Section 15064.5(a)(3), a lead agency should find that a property is historically significant if it determines that it 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. A mitigation measure is included to reduce the magnitude of cumulative impact 4.5-5, but this impact is identified as significant and unavoidable because the feasibility and/or implementation of mitigation falls within the responsibility of 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>4.5-1</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5-4</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the 2003 LRDP could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5-5</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development under the 2003 LRDP would contribute to cumulative damage to and loss of the resource base of unique archaeological resources and historical resources (including archaeological sites and historic buildings and structures) in Yolo and Solano counties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 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>
<th>Cultural Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5-1(a)</td>
<td>As early as possible in the project planning process, the campus shall define the project’s area of potential effects (APE) for archaeological resources and, if structures are present on the site, for historic structures. The campus shall determine the potential for the project to result in cultural resource impacts, based on the extent of ground disturbance and site modification anticipated for the proposed project. Based on this information, the campus shall:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>Prepare an inventory of all buildings and structures within the APE that will be 50 years of age or older at the time of project construction for review by a qualified architectural historian. If no structures are present on the site, there would be no impact to historic built environment resources from the project. If potentially historic structures are present, LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(c) shall be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Determine the level of archaeological investigation that is appropriate for the project site and activity, as follows:

- **Minimum**: excavation less than 18 inches deep and in a relatively small area (e.g., a trench for lawn irrigation, tree planting, etc.). Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(b)(i).

- **Moderate**: excavation below 18 inches deep and/or over a large area on any site that has not been characterized and is not suspected to be a likely location for archaeological resources. Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1 (b)(i) and (ii).

- **Intensive**: excavation below 18 inches and/or over a large area on any site that is within 800 feet of the historic alignment of Putah Creek, or that is adjacent to a recorded archaeological site. Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1 (i), (ii) and (iii).

During the planning phase of the project, the campus shall implement the following steps to identify and protect archaeological resources that may be present in the APE:

(i) For project sites at all levels of investigation, contractor crews shall be required to attend an informal training session prior to the start of earth moving, regarding how to recognize archaeological sites and artifacts. In addition, campus employees whose work routinely involves disturbing the soil shall be informed how to recognize evidence of potential archaeological sites and artifacts. Prior to disturbing the soil, contractors shall be notified that they are required to watch for potential archaeological sites and artifacts and to notify the campus if any are found. In the event of a find, the campus shall implement item (vi), below.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? ☐ ☐ ☑ ☐ ☐

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

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

a) The project site is currently developed with campus buildings that are less than 50 years old and are not considered historical buildings. No impact would occur.

b) The 2003 LRDP EIR identified that development under the 2003 LRDP could damage or destroy archaeological resources (LRDP Impact 4.4-1). This risk is highest on the portions of the campus along the historic banks of the tributaries and slough channels of Putah Creek and in the vicinity of previously discovered archaeological sites. The proposed project site is located approximately ¾ mile north of the zone of cultural sensitivity bordering the historic channel of Putah Creek (now the Arboretum waterway) and approximately ½ mile east and north of cultural site CA-YOL-134, located near the University Extension Center. Site CA-YOL-134 contained human burials and other associated artifacts. Previous archaeological investigations have not precisely defined the boundaries of CA-YOL-134.

In compliance with 2003 LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(a), the campus has retained a qualified archaeologist to perform an archaeological survey of the project area. A surface survey is being conducted on and adjacent to the project site, and subsurface testing will accomplished using auger probes within the site. No cultural resources are expected to be identified in the project area and no additional archaeological work is expected to be recommended because the project site has been previously disturbed and all prior archaeological surveys and monitoring in this part of campus has produced negative results. In compliance with LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(b) (ii) an archaeological monitoring plan that reflects the result of the cultural resources site surveys will be developed and implemented during construction of the Segundo Services Center to ensure that in the remote chance that any archaeological materials are uncovered during project construction, all work in the immediate vicinity stops until a qualified archaeologist can assess the find. With implementation of LRDP Mitigation Measures, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

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 a low 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 due to development through implementation of measures including identification, Native American consultation, preservation in place or recovery, respectful treatment and study, and reinternment. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Summary

Mitigation Measures 4.5-1(a-b), 4.5-4(a-d), and 4.5-5 from the 2003 LRDP EIR are being utilized by the proposed project to reduce the significance of impacts on cultural resources to the extent feasible. The proposed project would not increase 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 Ranges. There is a potential for seismic ground shaking in the Davis region from subsurface thrust faults within these regional foothills and within 100 miles of the campus. 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

A site-specific geotechnical investigation will be performed for the project in order to ensure that the foundation design complies with required building codes and that adequate consideration is given to the site specific conditions. No unique site conditions are expected because the results of nearby geotechnical investigations for prior projects have not produced any unique findings. If any unique site conditions are discovered during the geotechnical investigation the engineering and design process for the foundation will incorporate these findings to ensure adequate foundation design for code compliance.

7.6.2 2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance
The 2003 LRDP EIR considered 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 and there are no mitigation measures in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are applicable to the proposed project.

The proposed project is evaluated in the checklist and discussion below.

### 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 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>
</tbody>
</table>
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.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Must</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Must</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Must</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv) Landslides?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Must</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Must</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Must</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Must</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d)</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?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Must</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. 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 item (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. Therefore, the 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 potential for soil erosion is addressed in item (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,
therefore, the impact would be less than significant. The results of the geotechnical investigation will be incorporated into the design process to ensure compliance with applicable codes.

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

No LRDP EIR mitigation measures from the 2003 LRDP EIR are included in the proposed project. The proposed project would not exceed the levels of significance of cumulative 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.
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

A Phase 1A Preliminary Site Assessment Due Diligence survey was conducted for the proposed project site that included a site reconnaissance and review of past and present land uses. The survey did not identify any hazardous materials or waste contamination on the site area (Kermoyan 2004). Materials containing lead and asbestos are known to exist within the existing dining commons building. These and similar materials requiring special treatment or handling during building demolition (such as light ballasts with potential for PCB’s and computer monitors designated as hazardous waste) will be handled in accordance with the campus procedures for solid waste materials.

7.7.2 2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance

The 2003 LRDP EIR considered 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 ("P" and “h” in the checklist below) were found not applicable to campus growth under the 2003 LRDP.

7.7.3 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. None of the potentially significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR are relevant to the proposed project. LRDP Impacts 4.7-1, 4.7-2, 4.7-5, 4.7-6,
4.7-8, 4.7-9, 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</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7-2</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7-8</td>
<td>Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase the routine transport of hazardous materials to and from campus, which would not significantly increase hazards to the public or the environment.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7-9</td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7-12</td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7-13</td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7-17</td>
<td>Campus development under the 2003 LRDP could physically interfere with the campus’ Emergency Operations Plan.</td>
<td>PS</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 implementing the 2003 LRDP, they are not 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 the 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2003 LRDP EIR MITIGATION MEASURES</th>
<th>HAZARDS &amp; HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.7-1</td>
<td>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...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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 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 alternatives travel routes.

The proposed project is evaluated in the checklist and discussion below.

7.7.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant 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) 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>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  

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

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?  

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

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?  

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

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?  

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

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

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

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

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

a) Construction of the proposed project would involve the use of various products that could contain materials classified as hazardous (including solvents, adhesives, cements, paints, cleaning agents, and degreasers). Fuels, such as gasoline and diesel, would also be used in heavy equipment and other construction vehicles. During operation of the proposed project, small quantities of household-type cleaners would be used in building maintenance. The use of such products containing hazardous chemical materials already occurs on campus (and at the project site in the existing dining commons building), and the amounts associated with these uses would be similar to existing operation and maintenance activities.

**Hazardous Chemicals**

The 2003 LRDP EIR identified that implementation of the 2003 LRDP would increase routine hazardous chemical use (Impact 4.7-1), routine hazardous materials transport to and from the campus (Impact 4.7-8), and routine generation of hazardous chemical wastes (Impact 4.7-2) by UC Davis laboratories, departments, and maintenance/support operations, which would not create significant hazards to the public or the environment. The types and
amounts of hazardous materials associated with the construction and operation of the proposed project would be very limited in comparison to the materials already used on campus. The proposed building is a community service building with office space that will not include laboratory space. Hazardous chemicals in the building are expected to be limited to cleaning and maintenance materials used by custodial staff during regular operations. 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. Relevant safety programs will be implemented and relevant standards will be met regarding hazardous materials use, transport, and waste management for the proposed project as well as 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 identified 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 identified 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, Davis Montessori School, and Redbud Montessori School north of the west campus; and the Grace Valley Christian Academy on County Road 98. However, these schools are not within ¼ mile of the proposed project. Hazardous materials associated with construction and household-type cleaners used in maintenance of the proposed project 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 was listed as a hazardous materials site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The proposed project would not disturb this site, which is approximately two miles away.

The 2003 LRDP EIR identified 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 4.7-13). Campus policy requires that due diligence surveys be performed for all proposed project sites as part of the project planning process. Consistent with campus policy, the campus conducted a Phase 1A Preliminary Site Assessment Due Diligence Report for the proposed project site. The assessment included a site reconnaissance and review of past and present land uses. The report concluded that no environmental contamination of the property was apparent but that lead and asbestos associated with the existing building would need to be handled in accordance with state law and campus solid waste management procedures (Kermoyan 2004). The proposed project site would not expose persons to existing hazardous materials or waste contamination. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

e) The 2003 LRDP EIR identified 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 in the west campus and would not conflict with airport operations. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

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 identified that implementation of the 2003 LRDP could interfere with the campus’ Emergency Operations Plan through construction-related road closures (Impact 4.7-17). No road closures are planned as part of the proposed project. Converting part of Bioletti Road to one-way traffic during installation of utilities may be necessary but would not disrupt emergency vehicle service. 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 continue to be implemented for the proposed project. Therefore, the impact would be less-than-significant. 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 proposed project site is surrounded
by development and is 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 to reduce the significance of hazards and hazardous materials impacts. 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 Mayacmas 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 only major 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 covered by the campus’ Phase II Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP).

**Project Site**
The project site would only affect a previously developed area that currently is connected to the campus drainage, utility water, and domestic water systems. The proposed building footprint is smaller than the existing footprint of the Segundo Dining Commons building. The proposed Segundo Services Center project would result in less impervious surface than currently exists at the project site.

### 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. No significant or potentially significant hydrology and water quality impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR are relevant to the proposed project. 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.

### 2003 LRDP EIR IMPACTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8-1 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>
</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 and that will be required as part of project implementation 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. The benefits of these mitigation measures will be achieved independently of considering them 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>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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 Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans (SWPPPs) and with the Phase II SWMP to eliminate or reduce non-storm and storm water discharges to receiving waters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.8.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYDROLOGY &amp; WATER QUALITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Would the project…</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potentially Significant Impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

☐ ☐ ☑ ☐ ☐

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?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

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?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

α,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
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**

The proposed project would not increase the amount of sanitary sewer effluent being treated at the campus WWTP. The campus population is not expected to increase as a result of the proposed project and the proposed project would not generate additional waste water for treatment. The restrooms in the proposed Segundo Services Center will include low flow water fixtures which may reduce the amount of sanitary sewer effluent being sent to the campus WWTP. No impact is expected.

b) **Deep Aquifer**

The proposed project would not increase the campus population and is not expected to increase the demand for domestic water from the deep aquifer because the employees who will work in the building are already employed on-campus. Because no additional water from the deep aquifer would be used as a result of the proposed project, no impact is expected.

**Shallow/Intermediate Aquifer**

The proposed project would not increase demand for utility water from shallow/intermediate aquifers for irrigation of the project’s landscaped areas. The proposed project would be located on previously developed land (approximately 2 acres) within the core campus and the project site is currently served by utility water. The project is not expected to increase the amount of water needed for landscaping irrigation. Accordingly, no impact is expected.

c) The project would redevelop an approximately 2-acre site with a building, bike parking, and other landscaped areas. Currently, storm water on the proposed project site evaporates and percolates, and runoff from the site drains to the campus storm water drainage system for discharge to the Arboretum waterway. The developed project site would connect to the campus storm water drainage system. The proposed project is expected to have less runoff than the existing site because the amount of impervious surface will decrease as a result of project implementation. No impact would occur.
d,e) The proposed project would redevelop approximately 2 acres, and runoff from the developed project site would drain to the campus storm drainage system. The 2003 LRDP EIR identified that implementation of the 2003 LRDP would alter drainage patterns on the campus 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). The proposed project would not alter drainage patterns or discharge amounts. No impact would occur.

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

g, h) The proposed project would be constructed outside the 100-year flood zone. Therefore, no impact would occur.

i) 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 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 Measure 4.8-1 from the 2003 LRDP EIR is relevant to the proposed project to reduce less than significant 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 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 Segundo Services Center project site is a two-acre area within the center of the approximately 10-acre Segundo Housing District which provides housing for 1,600 students within the core campus at UC Davis. The 2003 LRDP designates the area for housing uses and the proposed uses within the Segundo Services Center are consistent with the uses allowed in the housing land use designation. The entire Segundo Housing District is bounded by Russell Boulevard on the north, La Rue Road on the west, a major east-west bicycle path on the south and additional student housing areas to the east. The Segundo Services Center site sits in the middle of the Segundo District and is a rectangular shaped area oriented in an east-west direction and bounded on the north and south by mid-rise residence halls built in the 1960’s. Current development at the project site consists of the lawn and path area at the east, a temporary food service building, the obsolete Segundo Dining Commons, and Parking Lot 24 which provides parking for 55 automobiles at the west end of the project site. Demolition of the obsolete Dining
Commons and removal of the temporary food service building will create an open area of sufficient size to accommodate the new Segundo Services Center and a new open space quad area. The new quad is planned for the east side of the project site and the Segundo Services Center is planned for the west side of the project site. The Segundo Services Center will serve as the focus of student activities and daily functions within the Segundo District and the new quad area will serve as the primary outdoor living space for the residents of the Segundo District. Figures 2, 3, and 4 in this Initial Study provide additional site details.

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>
</tbody>
</table>
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?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

d) Result in development of land uses that are substantially incompatible with existing adjacent land uses or with planned uses?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑

a) The proposed project would have no potential to physically divide an established community. The project is within a defined residential district at UC Davis and would redevelop the site with a building and landscaped area designed to enhance the sense of community, pedestrian access, and aesthetic appeal. No impact would occur and no additional analysis is required.

b) The applicable land use plan for the campus is the 2003 LRDP. The land use designation of Housing is consistent with the existing and the proposed use. 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 located approximately six miles from the 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. The proposed Segundo Services Center project would be compatible with the uses in the Segundo Housing district and would not present any conflict with surrounding or planned 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 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>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, d) 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**

The project site is a typical campus residential area with relatively low noise levels. Audible noise in the project area consists of student voices, mechanical equipment, and road noise. In general, the project site is quiet enough during the daytime to conduct outdoor conversations with small groups and not be disturbed by the background noise. Toward the west side of the project site, the loading dock for the existing dining commons building, automobile noise from Parking Lot 24, and road noise from La Rue Road combine to create a louder noise environment that is not viewed as adequate for quiet studying group discussions.

**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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noise Source</th>
<th>Criterion Noise Level</th>
<th>Substantial Increase in Noise Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Traffic and Other Long-Term Sources</td>
<td>65 dBA CNEL</td>
<td>&gt;=3 dBA if CNEL w/project is &gt;= 65 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;=5 dBA if CNEL w/project is 50–64 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;=10 dBA if CNEL w/project is &lt; 50 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadium (Periodic, intermittent)</td>
<td>70 dBA $L_{eq}(h)$ daytime (7:00 AM –7:00 PM)</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70 dBA $L_{eq}(h)$ evening (7:00 PM –11:00 PM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65 dBA $L_{eq}(h)$ nighttime (11:00 PM –7:00 AM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>Within 750 feet of railroad line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>65 dBA CNEL</td>
<td>&gt;=1.5 dBA if CNEL w/project is &gt;= 65 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;=3 dBA if CNEL w/project is 60–64 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;=5 dBA if CNEL w/project is &lt; 60 dBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (temporary)</td>
<td>80 dBA $L_{eq}(h)$ daytime</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80 dBA $L_{eq}(h)$ evening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70 dBA $L_{eq}(h)$ nighttime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The 2003 LRDP would not substantially increase rail activity; therefore, a threshold of significance for rail noise is not included in this table.
- At noise-sensitive land use unless otherwise noted. Noise-sensitive land uses include residential and institutional land uses.
- $L_{eq}(h)$ is an average measurement over a one-hour period.
- Screening analysis distance criterion from FTA 1995.
- $L_{eq}(8h)$ 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.

<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>4.10-1 Construction of campus facilities pursuant to the 2003 LRDP could expose nearby receptors to excessive groundborne vibration and airborne or groundborne noise.</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 and that will be required as part of project implementation 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. The benefits of these mitigation measures will be achieved independently of considering them 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>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOISE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10-1 Prior to initiation of construction, the campus shall approve a construction noise mitigation program including but not limited to the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Construction equipment shall be properly outfitted and maintained with feasible noise-reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
devices to minimize construction-generated noise.

- Stationary noise sources such as generators or pumps shall be located 100 feet away from noise-sensitive land uses as feasible.

- Laydown and construction vehicle staging areas shall be located 100 feet away from noise-sensitive land uses as feasible.

- Whenever possible, academic, administrative, and residential areas that will be subject to construction noise shall be informed a week before the start of each construction project.

- Loud construction activity (i.e., construction activity such as jackhammering, concrete sawing, asphalt removal, and large-scale grading operations) within 100 feet of a residential or academic building shall not be scheduled during finals week.

- Loud construction activity as described above within 100 feet of an academic or residential use shall, to the extent feasible, be scheduled during holidays, Thanksgiving breaks, Christmas break, Spring break, or Summer break.

- Loud construction activity within 100 feet of a residential or academic building shall be restricted to occur between 7:30 AM and 7:30 PM.

### 7.11.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

#### NOISE

<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) 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>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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) Construction of the proposed project would include demolition of the existing dining commons building which is a single-story brick and concrete structure. Demolition of the building would include removal of the roof and walls as well as complete removal of the foundation. Large scale mechanized machinery, including of pneumatic jackhammers mounted on a track driven tractor, are expected to be used. The demolition activities are expected to exceed the noise levels identified as thresholds for significance in the 2003 LRDP EIR. In accordance with the 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.10-1, the demolition activities would take place only during a break in the school year (summer break, winter break, or specific holidays) and would be restricted to the hours of 7:30 AM to 7:30 PM. Compliance with LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.10-1 would reduce the significance of the construction noise impact to a less than significant level because the nearby residence halls would not be occupied during the demolition activities.

b, d) As discussed above, 2003 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.10-1 would be implemented to reduce the project noise impact from demolition activities to a less-than-significant level. This mitigation measure would also reduce any effects of vibration to a less than significant level. After project demolition, construction noise from the project 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. LRDP Mitigation 4.10 1, included in the proposed project, would be implemented to control construction noise and the potential impact would be less than significant.

c) Generation of noise levels on or adjacent to the project site associated with vehicle trips, mechanical equipment, other equipment would contribute to ambient noise levels on campus. The existing dining commons building generates substantial noise in the area of the loading dock on the west side of the building. The proposed building would not include a loading dock; therefore, the area noise levels would decrease as a result of removing the loading dock. No impact would occur.

The 2003 LRDP EIR recognized that increased population associated with development under the 2003 LRDP in combination with other regional development would cumulatively increase ambient noise levels. The proposed project does not contribute to increased ambient noise levels.
population levels and accordingly, would not contribute to increased cumulative development and the associated noise impacts. No impact would occur.

e) The proposed project is within two miles of the 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. Therefore, the project would not expose people to excessive noise levels associated with this public use airport, and the impact is less than significant.

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 as explained in item e) above.

**Summary**

Mitigation measure 4.10-1 from the 2003 LRDP EIR is relevant to the proposed project to reduce 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.

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) were 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 proposed project is within the scope of analysis in the 2003 LRDP EIR. None of the significant population and housing impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR are relevant to the proposed project and no mitigation measures in the 2003 LRDP EIR are applicable to the proposed project.

### 7.12.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION &amp; HOUSING</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) 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>
<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>
<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>
<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>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) The project would not directly result in increased enrollment or employment. No impact would occur. The project would not extend roads, infrastructure, or any other service that would be needed for new growth and consequently, the project would not result in any indirect population growth.

b) The proposed project would not displace any existing housing. Therefore, no impact would occur.

c) The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people. Therefore, no impact would occur.

d) The project would not result in increased enrollment or employment; hence, it would not create housing demand. Therefore, no impact 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.
7.13 **PUBLIC SERVICES**

7.13.1 **Background**

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 4.12 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, in conjunction with other regional growth, on 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 achieved 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.

### 7.13.2 2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance

The 2003 LRDP EIR considered 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 7.13 Recreation, and effects associated with the capacity of the 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. None of the significant public services impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR are relevant to the proposed project and no mitigation measures in the 2003 LRDP EIR are applicable to the proposed project.

The proposed project is evaluated in the checklist and discussion below.

### 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>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed project involves the construction of a new housing support building on the central campus. The building would replace the existing dining commons building that is currently occupying the site but would not increase the campus population. The new building would not increase the amount of fire or police service protection. No impact would occur.

Regional Fire and Police Protection

The proposed project would not increase the campus population and would not contribute to the regional demand for increased fire and police protection due to regional growth.

Schools

The proposed project would not increase the campus population and would not contribute to the regional demand for increased school facilities due to regional growth.

Parks

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

Libraries

The proposed project would not increase the campus population and would not contribute to the regional demand for increased library facilities due to regional growth.

Summary

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 new or modified 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.

7.14.2 2003 LRDP EIR Standards of Significance

The 2003 LRDP EIR considered 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. None of the significant recreation impacts identified in the 2003 LRDP EIR are relevant to the proposed project and no mitigation measures in the 2003 LRDP EIR are applicable to the proposed project.
The proposed project is evaluated in the checklist and discussion below.

### 7.14.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

#### RECREATION

<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) 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?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a, b) The proposed project does not include any outdoor recreational facilities. The proposed project would not contribute to the growth anticipated in the 2003 LRDP. No impact would occur.

**Summary**

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 2005.

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

Pedestrian and bicycle access to the project site are provided from all directions. From the north, east, and south, combined bike and pedestrian paths lead through the Segundo Housing District to the project site. From the west, bicycle and pedestrian access is available for pedestrians via the sidewalk on La Rue Road and for cyclists, access is available by utilizing La Rue Road and traveling through Parking Lot 24. Pedestrian and bicycle access to the project site would not change as a result of the proposed project. Circulation improvements for bikes and pedestrians in the Segundo District are currently underway as a result of the Segundo Dining Commons project and these changes are expected to improve the efficiency and safety of area users by creating a more direct bicycle route outside of the internal Segundo District circulation patterns for campus users who are not affiliated with the Segundo District.

Vehicular access to the project site is provided from La Rue Road and then through Parking Lot 24. The loading dock for the existing dining commons building is accessed through Parking Lot 24 and is used frequently to stock the dining commons kitchen with food for approximately 2,000 residents. Use of the loading dock will cease once the new dining commons building is completed. Parking Lot 24 provides 61 spaces and upon completion of the Segundo Center, the parking capacity will be reduced to approximately 10 spaces.

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>4.14-3 Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would create additional parking demand.</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 and that will be required as part of project implementation 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. The benefits of these mitigation measures will be achieved independently of considering them 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>
<th>TRANSPORTATION, CIRCULATION, &amp; PARKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.14-3(b) UC Davis shall continue to monitor parking demand on a quarterly basis to identify campus parking areas with a parking utilization over 90 percent. UC Davis shall provide additional parking if a proposed project is expected to increase the winter utilization rate to over 90 percent on the central campus, Health Sciences District, and/or major facilities of the west and south campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.15.4 Environmental Checklist and Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSPORTATION, CIRCULATION &amp; PARKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project…</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☑
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>b)</td>
<td>c)</td>
<td>d)</td>
<td>e)</td>
<td>f)</td>
<td>g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed project would not increase the campus population and would not increase the number of vehicle trips. No impact would occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts related to safety risks associated with the University Airport are discussed in Section 7.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.</td>
<td>The project would not make any changes to the roadway network and would not create or increase hazards due to design features such as dangerous intersections or incompatible uses. No impact would occur.</td>
<td>Impacts related to emergency access are discussed in Section 7.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.</td>
<td>The project would reduce the parking capacity within the core campus by reconfiguring Parking Lot 24 to accommodate approximately 10 vehicles rather than the current 61 vehicles. The loss of core campus parking spaces is not expected to result in inadequate parking capacity. The latest parking space utilization survey indicates availability of 300 spaces in the nearby Parking Lots 25 and 35 (UC Davis 2004). The impact to parking capacity would be less than significant. In compliance with LRDP Mitigation Measure 4.13-3 (b), the campus continues to monitor parking demand on a quarterly basis to identify campus parking areas with a parking utilization over 90 percent.</td>
<td>The proposed project would not increase the campus population and is not expected to result in increased demand for transit services on campus. No impact would occur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

Mitigation measure 4.13-3(b) from the 2003 LRDP EIR is relevant to the proposed project to reduce the significance of traffic and circulation impacts to the extent feasible. The proposed project would not exceed the levels of significance of traffic impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant traffic 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 Utility and Service System effects of campus growth under the 2003 LRDP. The following discussion summarizes information presented in the ‘Setting’ subsection of Section 4.15 of the 2003 LRDP EIR.

The proposed project would use campus utilities and service systems including: domestic water, utility water, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, electricity, natural gas, chilled water, steam, 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 gpm. Domestic water (for building potable water and fire sprinklers) service will be provided to the proposed building from the existing six inch domestic water main running along the south side of the existing dining commons building. The main terminates at the southwest corner of the dining commons where the new service will connect to and extend to the proposed building.

- **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. Utility water (for irrigation use only) service will be provided to the proposed building from the six inch utility water main running along the north side of the existing dining commons building.

- **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. Sanitary sewer service will be provided from the existing 10 inch
sanitary sewer main located in La Rue Road or the existing eight inch sanitary
sewer main located north of the new building. The service lateral to the building
shall be at least six inches to provide acceptable service.

- **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. Site storm drainage will be connected to the existing storm drain
lines located on the north or south of the site or to the west (within the existing
parking lot). Roof drains will be piped directly into the storm drain system.

- **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 PG&E at the
campus substation located south of I-80 and from an approximately 2.7 MW
cogeneration plant located on the core campus in the CHCP facility. 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. There
is an existing electrical transformer located in the service yard of the dining
commons building. This transformer serves the existing dining commons and the
four high rise dormitories surrounding the site. It is located within the proposed
building footprint and will need to be replaced with a new transformer located
outside the proposed footprint of the building. The existing services will need to
be rerouted to the new transformer and connected before the old transformer can
be removed. Service to the new building will come from this new transformer.

- **Natural Gas:** The campus purchases natural gas from outside vendors and
provides it to the campus facilities through PG&E pipelines. Natural gas is
provided to four locations on campus for use and distribution: the CHCP, the
Primate Center Plant, the Cogeneration Plant, and the Master Meter #1. Peak
natural gas demand in 2001-02 was approximately 2,900 therms per hour. The natural gas service will connect to the existing 2.5 inch natural gas main running along the south side of the existing dining commons building.

- **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 chilled water service and return will be connected to the existing chilled water/chilled water return stubs located southeast of the project site, between Gilmore and Bixby Halls. The service shall consist of pipe and return pipes extending from the existing stubs to the proposed building. The steam and steam condensate return services will be connected to the existing steam and condensate return mains located just east of Gilmore Hall. A new steam vault shall be constructed within the new building’s mechanical room or within 50 feet of the building.

- **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. The telecommunications service will be connected to the existing telecommunications vault located just east of Gilmore Hall.

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).

### 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, LRDP Impacts 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.

<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>4.15-9</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require expansion of campus communication facilities, which would not result in significant environmental effects.
Mitigation measures in the 2003 LRDP EIR that are relevant to the proposed project are presented below. Since these mitigation measures are already being carried out as part of implementing the 2003 LRDP, they are not 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 the 2003 LRDP EIR mitigation measures.

### 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>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 project would result in decreased effluent to the campus wastewater treatment plant. The Segundo Services building would produce less effluent than the existing dining commons building and accordingly, the total amount of effluent would decrease as result of the proposed project. Therefore, there would be no impact associated with possible exceedances of WWTP requirements.

b) **Domestic Water Facilities**

The project would connect to an existing water main at the project site but would use less water than the current building. No impact to domestic water facilities would occur.

**Utility Water Facilities**

The project would connect to a utility water main located at the project site for irrigation water. The use of drought tolerant and native species for the new landscaping is expected to reduce the total amount of irrigation water needed at the project site. No impact to utility water facilities would occur.

**Wastewater Facilities**

The proposed project would connect to the campus sanitary sewer system at a sewer main located on the project site. The proposed project would not increase the amount of wastewater produced by the campus. Improvements to the campus WWTP are not necessary to serve the proposed project. There would be no impact from the proposed project.
c) The project would connect to a campus storm drain at the project site. The proposed project would result in a decrease in the overall amount of impervious surface at the project site and, accordingly, the total amount of rain water draining from the site would decrease. There would be no impact to the campus storm drain system.

d) The proposed project is expected to require less domestic water than the existing dining commons building and total domestic water use at the site would decrease. There would be no impact due to water use from the proposed project.

e) The proposed project would result in decreased wastewater. There would be no impact due to wastewater capacity.

f) The waste disposal needs of the proposed project would be served by the campus landfill. The project is expected to generate typical campus refuse including food service products and office waste. The volume of waste is not expected increase over the existing conditions because the project does not result in any increase to the campus population. 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) As noted above, the solid waste from the proposed project is expected to consist of limited food service and office waste items. The proposed project would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, no impact would occur.

h) The proposed project would utilize less electricity, natural gas, chilled water, and steam than the existing building and no new or expanded facilities would be require to serve the project. No impact would occur.

i) The project would need additional telecommunication service that would exceed the amount of service currently provided to the existing dining commons building. The increased service would be provided by connecting to the existing telecommunications vault located within the project site at a location just east of Gilmore Hall. 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). Providing telecommunication extensions for the proposed project would occur within a previously disturbed area. 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 Mitigation 4.15-9, relevant to 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.
Summary

Mitigation measure 4.15-9 from the 2003 LRDP EIR is relevant to the proposed project to 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 impacts previously addressed in the 2003 LRDP EIR, nor would it introduce any new significant utility impacts that were not previously addressed.
### MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<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)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information is 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. It would incrementally contribute to, but would not exceed, significant and unavoidable impacts related to transportation/circulation, noise, air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, biological resources, hydrology and water quality, geology and soils, cultural resources, aesthetics, public services, and utilities and service systems. These impacts were adequately analyzed in the 2003 LRDP EIR and fully addressed in the Findings and Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. No conditions have changed and no new information is 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 does not have a potential to adversely affect wildlife or the habitat upon which wildlife depend. Therefore, a filing fee will not be paid.

__X__ Certificate of Fee Exemption

____  Pay Fee
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PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Lead Agency: University of California

Project Proponent: University of California, Davis

Project Location: Segundo Services Center

Project Description: Redevelopment of two-acre site including demolition of existing dining commons building, construction of community services building, installation of new landscaping.

Mitigation Measure: No project specific mitigation measures are proposed.

Reference: This Proposed 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 will be circulated for public and agency review from December 13, 2004 to January 11, 2005. Comments received during the review period and responses to these comments will be presented in the final Tiered Initial Study.