

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS IN CONNECTION
WITH THE APPROVAL OF REVISIONS TO THE APPROVED AMBULATORY
CARE CENTER EXPANSION AND EYE CENTER, UC DAVIS HEALTH
SACRAMENTO CAMPUS**

**I. APPROVAL OF THE 2019 ADDENDUM TO THE UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA DAVIS HEALTH 2010 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE AMBULATORY
CARE CENTER EXPANSION AND EYE CENTER PROJECT DATED
OCTOBER 2019**

The Board of Regents of the University of California (“University”), as the lead agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), prepared an Addendum (“October 2019 Addendum”) to the Final Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) for the University of California, Davis Health (“UCD Health”) 2010 Long Range Development Plan (“2010 LRDP”) (State Clearinghouse No. 2009112060) for the Ambulatory Care Center (ACC) Expansion with Eye Center Project (“Project”) to document that no subsequent or supplemental EIR to the 2010 LRDP EIR was necessary to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project pursuant to CEQA. The 2010 LRDP EIR was certified by the University in November 2010. Subsequently, the 2020 LRDP was approved and the 2020 LRDP EIR certified in November 2020. Changes to the LRDP did not affect the consistency of the ACC Expansion with Eye Center Project with the LRDP, and it is consistent with the 2020 LRDP.

The University is now proposing to revise the Project to be constructed to add 2,000 additional square feet (SF) to the Eye Center building, and redesign 2 of the 4 floors of the proposed building, consistent with both the 2010 and 2020 LRDPs.

The University has examined the revised Project, in light of the project-level environmental analysis for the Project previously conducted and provided in the 2010 LRDP EIR with the October 2019 Addendum, and has determined that all of the potential environmental effects of the revised Project are fully evaluated in the 2010 LRDP EIR with the October 2019 Addendum. The University has not identified any significant new information or change in circumstances related to the Project that would result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of environmental impacts identified in 2010 LRDP EIR with the October 2019 Addendum. Therefore, the University has determined that no subsequent or supplemental EIR to the 2010 LRDP EIR including the October 2019 Addendum is necessary to evaluate modifications to or changes in the environmental analysis of the Project as revised pursuant to CEQA.

The University finds and determines that the 2010 LRDP EIR and October 2019 Addendum, 2010 LRDP Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, and the other information in the administrative record provide the basis for approval of the revised Project and support the Findings set forth in Section II, below.

II. FINDINGS

Having received, reviewed, and considered the 2010 LRDP EIR, the 2010 LRDP Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, and the October 2019 Addendum for the ACC Expansion with Eye Center

Project, and other information in the administrative record, the University hereby adopts the following Findings for the revised Project in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the University of California Procedures for Implementation of CEQA. The University adopts these Findings in conjunction with its approval of the revised design of the Project, as set forth in the following paragraphs.

A. Relationship to 2010 LRDP EIR, the 2010 LRDP Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, and the October 2019 Addendum for the ACC Expansion with Eye Center Project

The revisions to the Project consist of minor changes to the approved Project that was the subject of the October 2019 Addendum for the ACC Expansion with Eye Center Project, which concluded that only minor revisions to the 2010 LRDP EIR were required for the Project.

B. Project Description

At this time, while the building is under construction, the Project is proposed to be revised to add an additional 2,000 SF to the planned Eye Center building, and to redesign 2 of the 4 floors of the proposed Eye Center building. This project revision would slightly increase the building's square footage from 76,400 gross square feet (gsf) to 78,400 gsf. The proposed revisions to the Eye Center Project would support the addition of the Center for Ocular Regenerative Therapy (CORT) research clinic to the existing Eye Center program and would be fully consistent with the goals of the Project, which are:

- Improve capabilities of existing eye services by increasing size, improving functionality and efficiencies.
- Improve patient care and experience via enhanced equipment and building technology.
- Benefit from existing adjacencies to surgical facilities and patient parking/access points.
- Relieve space constraints on the existing ACC building to facilitate the Clinical Services Master Plan effort.
- Consolidate services from outlying leased facilities to add further efficiency.
- Develop shell space to mitigate seismic needs.

C. Adequacy of Prior Environmental Reviews

All of the environmental effects of implementation of the 2010 LRDP with the addition of the Project, as reflected in the Findings adopted by the University for the 2010 LRDP in November 2010 and for the October 2019 Addendum in October 2019, were adequately addressed in the certified 2010 LRDP FEIR and the October 2019 Addendum in that those impacts: (1) have been mitigated or avoided; (2) have been examined at a sufficient level of detail to enable those effects to be mitigated or avoided by site-specific revisions, the imposition of conditions, or by other means in connection with the approval of the LRDP; or (3) cannot be mitigated to avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts despite the University's

willingness to accept all feasible mitigation measures, and the only purpose of including analysis of such effects in another environmental impact report would be to put the agency in a position to adopt a statement of overriding considerations with respect to the impacts.

These Findings summarize, rely upon, and incorporate the 2010 LRDP FEIR Findings and the October 2019 Addendum Findings to address cumulative impacts, consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(d).

The revised Project is largely the same as the Project analyzed in the October 2019 Addendum, with the minor increase in the size of the building (an addition of 2,000 SF) and redesign for two floors of the building. The revised Project is therefore within the scope of impacts identified in the 2010 LRDP FEIR and the October 2019 Addendum and does not implicate any of the conditions set forth in CEQA Section 21166 or State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, requiring the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR to the LRDP FEIR. With the implementation of relevant certified 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation measures, no new significant environmental impacts have been identified in connection with the revised Project that were not considered in the 2010 LRDP EIR and as described in the October 2019 Addendum. The proposed revisions to the Project would not constitute substantial changes in the Project or in the circumstances under which the Project will be implemented that would require revisions to the existing 2010 LRDP EIR. All significant impacts to which the revised Project will contribute have been addressed in the 2010 LRDP EIR and the 2010 LRDP Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by the University in connection with its approval of the 2010 LRDP. As a result, no new effects are anticipated to occur, and no new mitigation measures will be required other than as addressed in the 2010 LRDP FEIR. The Project as revised does not otherwise provide an opportunity to eliminate or substantially reduce any of the significant and unavoidable impacts of implementing the 2010 LRDP.

In accordance with Section 15168(c) of the CEQA Guidelines, the University hereby finds that none of the circumstances described in Section 15162(a) of the CEQA Guidelines is present, and no further environmental review or documentation is required for the revised Project.

D. Incorporation by Reference

These Findings incorporate by reference in their entirety the text of the 2010 LRDP FEIR and the October 2019 Addendum prepared for the Project and the Findings adopted in support of the 2010 LRDP previously adopted by the University. Without limitation, this incorporation is intended to elaborate on the scope and nature of the project, its potential environmental impacts, and the basis for determining the significance of the project's impacts.

E. Mitigation Monitoring

CEQA requires the Lead Agency approving a project to adopt a monitoring program for changes to the project that it adopts or makes a condition of project approval, including mitigation measures intended to eliminate or reduce potentially significant impacts of the project, in order to ensure compliance during project implementation. No new mitigation measures are required as part of the project, which incorporates relevant and previously adopted 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation measures and/or continuing best practices that will be monitored pursuant to the existing 2010 LRDP EIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) previously adopted by the University in connection with its approvals of the 2010 LRDP. No new project-specific mitigation measures are required as part of the revised Project.

F. Record of Proceedings

Various documents and other materials constitute the record of proceedings upon which the University bases its findings and decision contained herein. These documents and materials are located in UC Davis Health, Office of FD&C, 4800 Second Avenue, Suite 3010, Sacramento, CA, 95817.

G. Summary

Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record of proceedings, the University has made one or more of the following Findings with respect to the significant environmental impacts of the revised Project:

- 1) The revised Project will not increase the severity of significant environmental impacts previously identified in the 2010 LRDP FEIR.
- 2) All 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation measures relevant to the Project, as identified in the October 2019 Addendum, are made a condition of approval of the revised Project.
- 3) All potentially significant effects on the environment due to the implementation of the revised Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible through 2010 LRDP FEIR mitigation measures identified in the October 2019 Addendum and adopted in connection with the Regents' approval of the 2010 LRDP. No project-specific mitigation measures are required.
- 4) The revised Project will not result in environmental effects that were not adequately examined in the University's 2010 LRDP FEIR.
- 5) All remaining significant impacts on the environment caused by implementation of the LRDP found to be unavoidable, remain acceptable due to the reasons set forth in the LRDP FEIR Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by the University in connection with its approval of the 2010 LRDP, as referenced and reaffirmed herein.

III. APPROVAL

The University hereby takes the following actions:

- A. The University approves and make a condition of the revised Project all elements of the Project and relevant 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation measures.
- B. The University adopts the Findings for the revised Project, with the addition of 2,000 SF to be added to the Eye Center building, and the redesign of 2 of the 4 floors of the Eye Center building as set forth in Section II, above.
- C. Having independently reviewed and analyzed the proposed revised Project against the 2010 LRDP EIR and October 2019 Addendum, conditioned the project as described above, and adopted the Findings, the University approves the revised Project, with the addition of 2,000 SF to be added to the Eye Center building, and the redesign of 2 of the 4 floors of the Eye Center building at the UC Davis Sacramento campus.

Exhibit 1: Ambulatory Care Center Expansion With Eye Center Project CEQA Findings

Exhibit 2: 2010 LRDP CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations

Exhibit 1:

**UC Davis Ambulatory Care Center Expansion With Eye Center Project
CEQA Findings**

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS IN CONNECTION
WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE AMBULATORY CARE CENTER EXPANSION
WITH EYE CENTER, UC DAVIS HEALTH CAMPUS**

**ADDENDUM TO THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS HEALTH 2010
LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
REPORT FOR THE AMBULATORY CARE CENTER EXPANSION WITH EYE
CENTER PROJECT DATED SEPTEMBER 2019**

The Board of Regents of the University of California (“University”), as the lead agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), prepared an Addendum (“Addendum October 2019”) to the Final Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) for the University of California, Davis Health (“UCD Health”) 2010 Long Range Development Plan (“2010 LRDP”) (State Clearinghouse No. 2009112060) for the Ambulatory Care Center Expansion with Eye Center Project (“project”) to document that no subsequent or supplemental EIR to the 2010 LRDP EIR is necessary to evaluate the environmental impacts of the project pursuant to CEQA. The 2010 LRDP EIR was certified by the University in November 2010.

Pursuant to the CEQA (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.), and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq.), the Board of Regents of the University of California (the University) has considered the FEIR for the UC Davis Sacramento campus LRDP FEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2009112060, November 2010) and the addendum for the proposed addition of the Eye Center to the existing ACC.

The LRDP FEIR and the addendum contain the environmental analysis and information necessary to support approval of the project, and it reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the University.

These Findings are hereby adopted by the University as required by Public Resources Code Sections 21081, 21081.5, 21081.6, and 21166, and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091, 15092, 15162, 15164, and 15168 in conjunction with the approval of the project.

I. FINDINGS

Having received, reviewed, and considered the 2010 LRDP EIR, the 2010 LRDP Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Addendum for the ACC Expansion with Eye Center Project, and other information in the administrative record, the University hereby adopts the following Findings for the project in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the University of California Procedures for Implementation of CEQA. The University adopts these Findings in conjunction with its approval of the design of the project, as set forth in Section II, below.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project includes an addition of an approximately 58,000 gross square feet (gsf) Eye Center to the existing Lawrence J. Ellison Ambulatory Care Center (ACC), approximately 17,500 gsf of renovation inside the ACC, demolition of the physical therapy center at the ACC, and roadway modifications, landscaping, and streetscape features along Y Street between 48th Street and 49th Street to accommodate the addition of the Eye Center at the UC Davis Sacramento campus. The project includes an amendment to the 2010 LRDP land use designations of approximately 15,000 gsf from Major Open Space to Ambulatory Care to accommodate the addition of the Eye Center. The ambulatory care land use designation would increase by 15,000 sf and the major open space designation would decrease by the same square footage.

III. ADEQUACY OF PRIOR ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEWS

All of the environmental effects of implementation of the LRDP, as reflected in the Findings adopted by the University (LRDP in November 2010), were adequately addressed in the certified LRDP FEIR in that those impacts: (1) have been mitigated or avoided; (2) have been examined at a sufficient level of detail to enable those effects to be mitigated or avoided by site-specific revisions, the imposition of conditions, or by other means in connection with the approval of the LRDP; or (3) cannot be mitigated to avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts despite the University's willingness to accept all feasible mitigation measures, and the only purpose of including analysis of such effects in another environmental impact report would be to put the agency in a position to adopt a statement of overriding considerations with respect to the impacts.

These Findings summarize, rely upon, and incorporate the LRDP FEIR Findings to address cumulative impacts, consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(d).

The project is within the scope of impacts identified in the LRDP FEIR and does not implicate any of the conditions set forth in CEQA Section 21166 or State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, requiring the preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR to the LRDP FEIR. With the implementation of relevant certified 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation measures, the project will not result in any new significant environmental impacts, will not increase the severity of significant impacts previously identified in the 2010 LRDP EIR, and will not cause any environmental effects not previously examined in the 2010 LRDP EIR. There have not been any substantial changes in the project or in the circumstances under which the project will be implemented that would require revisions to the existing 2010 LRDP EIR. All significant impacts to which the project will contribute have been addressed in the 2010 LRDP EIR and the 2010 LRDP Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by the University in connection with its approval of the 2010 LRDP. No new significant environmental impacts have been identified in connection with the project that were not considered in the 2010 LRDP FEIR. The project does not otherwise provide an opportunity to eliminate or substantially reduce any of the significant and unavoidable impacts of implementing the 2010 LRDP.

For the reasons described above, the University hereby finds that preparation of this Addendum to the LRDP FEIR to analyze the environmental consequences of implementing the project is appropriate under CEQA. In accordance with CEQA, the University hereby finds that none of the circumstances described in Section 15162(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines are present, and no further environmental review or documentation is required for the project.

IV. INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

These Findings incorporate by reference in their entirety the text of the 2010 LRDP FEIR prepared for the project and the Findings adopted in support of the LRDP previously adopted by the University. Without limitation, this incorporation is intended to elaborate on the scope and nature of the project, its potential environmental impacts, and the basis for determining the significance of the project's impacts.

V. MITIGATION MONITORING

CEQA requires the Lead Agency approving a project to adopt a monitoring program for changes to the project that it adopts or makes a condition of project approval, including mitigation measures intended to eliminate or reduce potentially significant impacts of the project, in order to ensure compliance during project implementation. No new mitigation measures are required as part of the project, which incorporates relevant and previously adopted 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation measures and/or continuing best practices that will be monitored pursuant to the existing 2010 LRDP EIR Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) previously adopted by the University in connection with its approvals of the 2010 LRDP. No new project-specific mitigation measures are required as part of the project.

VI. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Various documents and other materials constitute the record of proceedings upon which the University bases its findings and decision contained herein. These documents and materials are located in UC Davis Health, Office of FD&C, 4800 Second Avenue, Suite 3010, Sacramento, CA, 95817.

VII. SUMMARY

Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record of proceedings, the University has made one or more of the following Findings with respect to the significant environmental impacts of the project:

- 1) The project will not increase the severity of significant environmental impacts previously identified in the LRDP FEIR.
- 2) All 2010 LRDP EIR mitigation measures relevant to the project, as identified in the Addendum, are made a condition of approval of the project's approval.
- 3) All potentially significant effects on the environment due to the implementation of the project have

been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible through 2010 LRDP FEIR mitigation measures identified in the Addendum and adopted in connection with the Regents' approval of the 2010 LRDP. No project-specific mitigation measures are required.

- 4) The project will not result in environmental effects that were not adequately examined in the University's 2010 LRDP FEIR.
- 5) All remaining significant impacts on the environment caused by implementation of the LRDP found to be unavoidable, remain acceptable due to the reasons set forth in the LRDP FEIR Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by the University in connection with its approval of the 2010 LRDP, as referenced and reaffirmed herein.

Exhibit 2:

**UC Davis 2010 LRDP CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding
Considerations**

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS IN CONNECTION WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS SACRAMENTO CAMPUS 2010 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

I. CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The University of California (the “University”), as the lead agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), has prepared a Final Environmental Impact Report (“Final EIR” or “FEIR”) for the UC Davis Sacramento Campus Long Range Development Plan (the “2010 LRDP” or “Project”) for the University of California, Davis Sacramento campus (“UC Davis Sacramento Campus” or “Campus”). The Final EIR has been assigned State Clearinghouse No. 2009112060. The Final EIR consists of two volumes. Volume I of the Final EIR contains the programmatic analysis for the LRDP as well as the Appendices (on a disk). Volume II of the Final EIR contains the project-specific analysis for the Graduate Studies Center, a proposed building development to be considered for approval after the adoption of the Final EIR. The Final EIR assesses the potential environmental effects of implementation of the 2010 LRDP, identifies the means to eliminate or reduce potential significant adverse impacts, and evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed 2010 LRDP. The Final EIR provides text changes to the Draft EIR, responses to comments on the Draft EIR from public agencies, interested groups and individuals (the “Responses to Comments”), appendices, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the proposed 2010 LRDP.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15090, The Board of Regents of the University of California (“The Regents”) certifies that it has received the Final EIR, that it has further considered all additional written and oral statements received by The Regents prior to or at its public hearing on the Final EIR, and that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and received at its public hearing prior to making the following certifications and the findings in Sections II - V and the approvals in Section VI, below. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21082.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15090, The Regents hereby certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the University. The conclusions presented in these Findings are based upon the Final EIR and other evidence in the administrative record.

The Regents further certifies that the Final EIR satisfies the requirements for a long range development plan EIR prepared under Public Resources Code Section 21080.09 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15081.5.

The Findings set forth in Sections II - V, below, pertain to the approval of the 2010 LRDP. Future projects contemplated by the 2010 LRDP will be considered for approval by The Regents and/or University officials delegated such authority pursuant to the standing orders and bylaws of the University, as applicable, in accordance with and based upon the analysis in the Final EIR, and any additional project-level environmental review required under CEQA may be based upon the Final EIR or a tiered analysis based upon the Final EIR in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080.09.

II. FINDINGS

Having received, reviewed and considered the Final EIR and other information in the administrative record, The Regents hereby adopt the following Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the University's procedures for implementing CEQA for the 2010 LRDP. The Regents adopt these Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations in conjunction with its approval of the 2010 LRDP as set forth in Section III, below.

A. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

1. Preparation of the EIR

On November 18, 2009 the University released a Notice of Preparation ("NOP") of a Draft EIR for the proposed 2010 UC Davis Sacramento Campus Long Range Development Plan. The University issued a second NOP on April 14, 2010 to notify the public and reviewing agencies that the University intended to evaluate the environmental impacts of both the 2010 UC Davis Sacramento Campus Long Range Development Plan and a proposed new building, the Graduate Studies Center in the forthcoming Draft EIR. Two EIR scoping meetings were held on December 8, 2009, and a third scoping meeting was held on May 6, 2010, in the Facilities Support Services Building, Room 2030 on the UC Davis Sacramento Campus. These meetings were intended to inform the public and interested agencies of the proposed 2010 LRDP and Graduate Studies Center projects, solicit comments, and identify areas of concern.

On July 14, 2010, the University released a Notice of Completion ("NOC") for the Draft EIR to commence a 45-day review period. The University conducted a public hearing on July 29, 2010 in the Facilities Support Services Building, Room 2030 on the UC Davis Sacramento Campus to receive verbal comments on the Draft EIR. The comments received during the two NOP periods were evaluated and considered as part of the preparation of the Draft EIR. The comments received in conjunction with public and agency review of the Draft EIR were evaluated and considered as part of the preparation of the Final EIR.

The Final EIR contains all of the comments received during the public comment periods, together with written responses to those comments that were prepared in accordance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the University's procedures for implementing CEQA. The Regents has reviewed the comments received and responses thereto, and finds that the Final EIR provides adequate, good faith and reasoned responses to the comments.

2. Absence of Significant New Information

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 requires a lead agency to recirculate an EIR for further review and comment when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the Draft EIR but before certification. "Information" can include changes to the project, changes in the environmental setting, or additional data or other information. CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(a). Section 15088.5(a) further provides that "[n]ew information added to an EIR is not 'significant' unless the EIR is changes in a significant way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project

or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement.”

The FEIR includes comment responses, minor modifications to the impact analysis, and the proposed mitigation monitoring program. The Regents finds that these changes and additions to EIR do not alter the mitigation measures proposed in the Draft EIR and do not cause any new or substantially more severe environmental impacts. Therefore, in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, no further recirculation of the EIR is necessary based on the changes and additions in the Final EIR.

In addition, various minor modifications have been made to the text, tables of the Draft EIR and Recirculated Draft EIR, as set forth in section 2.0 of the Final EIR. These changes are generally of an administrative nature, such as correcting minor errors in the text, making minor adjustments to the data, and adding or changing parts of the text for purposes of clarification. The Regents finds that these changes do not entail any changes that would require recirculation of the EIR under CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

Having reviewed the information contained in the Final EIR and in the administrative record, as well as the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 and interpretive judicial authority regarding recirculation of draft EIRs, The Regents hereby find that no new significant information was added to the FEIR following public review and thus, recirculation of the FEIR is not required by CEQA.

3. Differences of Opinion Regarding the Impacts of the Project

In making its determination to certify the Final EIR and to approve the project, The Regents recognizes that the project implicates several controversial environmental issues, and that a range of technical and scientific opinion exists with respect to those issues. The Regents has acquired a better understanding of the breadth of this technical and scientific opinion by its review of the Final EIR, the comments received on the Draft EIR, and the responses to comments on the Draft EIR. Having reviewed and considered, as a whole, the evidence and analysis presented in the Final EIR as a whole, The Regents has gained a comprehensive and well-rounded understanding of the environmental issues presented by the proposed project. In turn, this understanding has enabled The Regents to make fully informed, thoroughly considered decisions after taking account of the various viewpoints on these important issues. The Regents accordingly find that these Findings are based on full appraisal of all viewpoints expressed in the Final EIR, as well as other relevant information in the record of proceedings for the proposed project.

B. IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The following section summarizes the environmental impacts of the project identified in the Final EIR, and includes the findings of The Regents as to those impacts, as required by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of The Regents regarding the environmental impacts of the project and the mitigation measures proposed by the Final EIR and adopted by The Regents and incorporated into the project.

These findings summarize the environmental determinations of the Final EIR about project impacts before and after mitigation, and do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the Final EIR. Instead, these findings provide a summary description of each impact from the EIR, describe the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and adopted by The Regents, and state The Regents' findings on the significance of each impact with the adopted mitigation measures. A full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the Final EIR, and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the Final EIR supporting the Final EIR's determinations regarding mitigation measures and the project's impacts. In making these findings, The Regents ratify, adopt and incorporate the analysis and explanation in the Final EIR in these findings, and ratify, adopt and incorporate in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Final EIR relating to mitigation measures and environmental impacts, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

In adopting mitigation measures as set forth below, The Regents intend to adopt each of the mitigation measures recommended in the Final EIR. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR has inadvertently been omitted from these findings, said mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language of the mitigation measures set forth below fails to accurately reflect the mitigation measures in the Final EIR due to a clerical error, the language of the mitigation measure as set forth in the Final EIR shall control, unless the language of the mitigation measure has been specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

With respect to measures that were suggested in the comments, and not included in the Final EIR, the responses to comments explain either that the suggested mitigation measures are either already part of ongoing campus programs and procedures or why they are infeasible and thus not recommended for adoption. The Regents hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the reasons stated in the responses to comments as the grounds for finding these suggested mitigation measures to be infeasible.

The Final FEIR found that the following campus impacts would be less than significant without mitigation: impacts to aesthetics (see EIR, Section 4.1.4.5--AES-1, AES-2); air quality (see EIR, Section 4.2.4.4—AIR-2, AIR-3, AIR-5, Cumulative AIR-2); biological resources (see EIR, Section 4.3.4.4—BIO-1); geology and soils (see EIR, Section 4.5.4.3—GEO-2, GEO-3, Cumulative GEO-1); Greenhouse Gas Emissions (see EIR, Section 4.6.4.4—Cumulative GHG-2); hazards and hazardous materials (see EIR, Section 4.7.4.4—HAZ-1, HAZ-2, HAZ-3, HAZ-4, HAZ-5, Cumulative HAZ-1); hydrology and water quality (see EIR, Section 4.8.4.3—Hydro-1, Hydro-2, Hydro-3, Hydro-4, Cumulative Hydro-2, Cumulative Hydro-3); land use and planning (see EIR, Section 4.9.3.4—LAN-2, Cumulative LAN-1); noise (see EIR, Section 4.10.4.2—NOI-3); population and housing (see EIR, Section 4.11.3.4—POP-1, Cumulative POP-1); public services (see EIR, Section 4.12.3.4—PS-1, PS-2, PS-3, PS-4, Cumulative PS-1); transportation and traffic (see EIR, Section 4.13.4.4—TRA-3, TRA-4, TRA-5, TRA-6, TRA-7); utilities and service systems (see EIR, Section 4.14.4.4---UTIL-1, UTIL-2, UTIL-3, UTIL-4, UTIL-6, UTIL-7, UTIL-8, Cumulative UTIL-1).

C. SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR THAT ARE REDUCED TO A LEVEL OF "LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT" BY MITIGATION MEASURES INCORPORATED INTO THE PROJECT.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1), the following potentially significant impacts identified in the Final EIR will be mitigated to less than significant levels or avoided by implementation of the Mitigation Measures hereby incorporated into the Project.

1. *Air Quality*

Impact AIR-4 *Implementation of the 2010 LRDP would expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants.*

MM AIR-4. Because the bulk of the TAC emissions resulting in the significant human health risk operational impacts would be emitted by the existing and future stationary sources on the campus such as the Central Energy Plant boilers, and emergency generator testing, a number of potential mitigation measures were identified that focused on these stationary sources. These mitigation measures include the following:

- Limit fuel oil usage to 40 hrs/yr for the Building 34 emergency generator
 - Limit natural gas usage to 500,000 Therms per year (each) for existing Central Energy Plant boilers 1, 2, 3, and 4
 - Limit natural gas usage to 500,000 Therms per year (each) for future Central Energy Plant boilers 1, 2, and 3
- Remove rain caps from the existing Central Plant boilers and replace with rain sleeves, while increasing overall stack height by 10 feet.

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP would affect toxic air contaminant levels. Mitigation Measure AES-3A is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact AIR-6 *Implementation of the 2010 LRDP would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.*

MM AIR-6. The University will implement **LRDP Mitigation Measure AIR-1**, which is designed to reduce construction emissions. It will also implement **LRDP Mitigation Measure TRA-1** which will reduce traffic-related air pollutant emissions resulting from campus operations. For new and expanded stationary sources on the campus, the University will comply with BACT and offset requirements.

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP would affect implementation air quality planning efforts. Mitigation Measure AIR-6 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

2. *Biological Resources*

Impact BIO-2 *Implementation of the 2010 LRDP could have a substantial adverse effect on nesting birds, including Cooper's hawks or purple martins.*

MM BIO-2. If a construction project is proposed on the campus that would commence anytime during the nesting/breeding season of native bird species potentially nesting on the site (typically February through August in the project region), a pre-construction survey of the project vicinity for nesting birds shall be conducted.

This survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist (i.e., experienced with the nesting behavior of bird species of the region) two weeks prior to the commencement of construction activities. The intent of the survey would be to determine if active nests of special-status bird species or other species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code are present within the construction zone or within an area surrounding the construction zone as determined by the biologist. The survey area shall include all trees and shrubs in the construction zone and the surrounding area. The survey area shall also include a search of any buildings/structures to be demolished or near the construction zone, for nesting purple martins. The survey shall be timed such that the last survey is concluded no more than two weeks prior to initiation of construction. If ground disturbance activities are delayed following a survey, then an additional pre-construction survey shall be conducted such that no more than two weeks will have elapsed between the last survey and the commencement of ground disturbance activities.

If active nests are found in areas that could be directly affected or are within 500 feet of construction and would be subject to prolonged construction-related noise and/or vibration, a no-disturbance buffer zone shall be created around active nests during the breeding season or until a qualified biologist determines that all young have fledged. The size of the buffer zones and types of construction activities restricted within them will be determined through consultation with CDFG, taking into account factors such as the following:

- Noise and human disturbance levels at the construction site at the time of the survey and the noise and disturbance expected during the construction activity;
- Distance and amount of vegetation or other screening between the construction site and the nest; and
- Sensitivity of individual nesting species and behaviors of the nesting birds.

Limits of construction to avoid an active nest shall be established in the field with flagging, fencing, or another appropriate barrier and construction personnel shall be instructed on the sensitivity of nest areas. The biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when construction activities would occur near active nest areas of special status bird species to ensure that no impacts on these nests occur.

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP would affect nesting birds, including Cooper's hawks or purple martins. Mitigation Measure BIO-2 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

3. *Cultural Resources*

Impact CUL-2 *Implementation of the 2010 LRDP could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource or result in disturbance to Native American remains.*

MM CUL-2. LRDP MM CUL-2a: For all project sites, site-work contractor crews shall be required to attend an informal training session prior to the start of earth moving, regarding how to recognize artifacts and human remains. Prior to disturbing the soil, contractors shall be notified that they are required to watch for potential artifacts and to notify the University if any are found. In the event of a find, the University shall implement **LRDP MM CUL-2b** and **CUL-2c** below.

LRDP MM CUL-2b: If an archaeological resource is discovered during construction, all soil disturbing work within 100 feet of the find shall cease. The University shall contact a qualified archaeologist within 24 hours to inspect the site. If a resource within the project area of potential effect is determined to qualify as a unique archaeological resource (as defined by CEQA), the University shall devote adequate time and funding to salvage the material. Any archaeologically important artifacts recovered during monitoring shall be cleaned, catalogued, and analyzed, with the results presented in a report of finding that meets professional standards.

LRDP MM CUL-2c: 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 University shall contact a qualified archaeologist within 24 hours to determine whether the bone is human. If the qualified archaeologist determines the bone is human, or if a qualified archaeologist is not present, the University will notify the County Coroner of the find before additional disturbance occurs. Consistent with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5(b), which prohibits disturbance of human remains uncovered by excavation until the Coroner has made a finding relative to PRC Section 5097 procedures, the University 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 University will comply with the provisions of PRC Section 5097.98 regarding identification and involvement of the Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD).

If human remains cannot be left in place, the University 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 University 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 University shall ensure that human remains and associated artifact recovered from campus projects are repatriated to the appropriate local tribal group if requested.

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP would affect archaeological resources or result in disturbance to Native American remains. Mitigation Measure CUL-2 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact CUL-3 *Implementation of the 2010 LRDP could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.*

MM CUL-3. LRDP MM CUL-3a: As a first step during the project’s environmental review, the University shall determine whether the proposed project is in the portion of the campus where human remains associated with the former burial ground could likely be encountered. If the project site is in or near that area, the University will retain a qualified archaeologist to review the project information and as necessary develop and implement a subsurface testing program to check for human remains. If no human remains are encountered, the project may proceed to construction.

LRDP MM CUL-3b: In the event that human remains are encountered during subsurface testing, the area of the project site will be excavated under the supervision of the archaeologist and all human remains and associated artifacts will be removed from the site and examined for data. After the lab work, all recovered human remains and associated artifacts will be placed in caskets and buried in a single mass grave at a local cemetery.

LRDP MM CUL-3c: Implement LRDP MM CUL-2a.

LRDP MM CUL-3d: Implement LRDP MM CUL-2c.

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP would affect human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. Mitigation Measure CUL-3 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

4. *Geology and Soils*

Impact GEO-1 Implementation of the 2010 LRDP could result in exposure of people or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving liquefaction.

MM GEO-1. A site-specific, design-level geotechnical investigation shall be conducted during the design phase of each building project under the 2010 LRDP. This investigation shall be conducted by a licensed geotechnical engineer and include a seismic evaluation of ground acceleration under the design event as well as relevant soil conditions at the site. Geotechnical recommendations shall subsequently be incorporated into the foundation and building design.

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP would expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving liquefaction. Mitigation Measure GEO-1 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

5. *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*

Impact GHG-1 Campus development under the 2010 LRDP would generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

MM GHG-1. LRDP MM GHG-1a: UC Davis shall implement green building design standards for all new construction developed under the 2010 LRDP in accordance with the UC Policy on Sustainable Practices.

- New building projects, other than acute-care facilities, shall outperform the required provisions of the California Energy Code (Title 24) energy-efficiency standards by at least 20 percent.
- New building projects, other than acute-care facilities, shall outperform the required provisions of the California Energy Code (Title 24) energy-efficiency standards by 30 percent or more, whenever possible within the constraints of program needs and standard budget parameters.
- UC Davis shall develop and implement, in consultation with other campuses and medical centers, standards for energy efficiency for new acute-care facilities.
- New building projects, except laboratory and acute care facilities, shall be certified to a minimum standard equivalent to a LEED™-NC “Silver” rating according to the version of LEED™-NC that is current at the time of design approval.
- New building projects, except laboratory and acute care facilities, shall be certified to a minimum standard equivalent to a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED™) “Gold” rating for new construction (NC), whenever possible within the constraints of program needs and standard budget parameters, according to the version of LEED™-NC that is current at the time of design approval.
- New laboratory building projects shall be certified to a minimum standard equivalent to a LEED™-NC “Silver” rating and the Laboratories for the 21st Century (Labs21) Environmental Performance Criteria (EPC), as appropriate. The design process will include attention to energy efficiency for systems not addressed by the California Energy Code (Title 24).
- New building projects shall achieve at least two of the available credits in the LEED™-NC Water Efficiency category and shall cooperate with local water district in efforts to conserve water and to meet reduced water use goals of the local district.
- New privatized development projects on Regents’ land where the project is to be used for a programmatic or auxiliary purpose (i.e., a University-related purpose) shall comply with the provisions of UC Policy on Sustainable Practices listed herein.
- New building projects built on Regents’ land pursuant to a ground lease by a private, institutional or government entity (Lessee) for the Lessee’s own use (whether in support the University’s mission or to generate income for the University) shall abide by the UC Policy provisions listed herein.

LRDP MM GHG-1b: The University of California is developing and UC Davis shall participate in a system-wide portfolio approach to reduce consumption of nonrenewable energy. The portfolio will include a combination of energy efficiency projects, the incorporation of local renewable power measures for existing and new facilities, green power purchases from the electrical grid, and other

energy measures with equivalent demonstrable effect on the environment and reduction in fossil fuel usage. UC Davis shall achieve a level of grid-provided electricity from renewable sources that is similar to or greater than the State's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS).

LRDP MM GHG-1c: UC Davis shall implement environmentally preferable purchasing practices for all new construction developed under the 2010 LRDP in accordance with the UC Policy on Sustainable Practices and the UC Davis CAP.

- New building projects shall procure only products with an ENERGY STAR® rating for product categories that have ENERGY STAR® rated products available, consistent with the needs of UC Davis researchers.
- New building projects shall require that suppliers ensure that all electronic equipment and items delivered to the project site enable all energy efficiency and conservation features, if the option exists and is consistent with the needs of the project.
- New building projects shall give preference to technologies that ensure the efficient use of water resources for all products and services that require the use of water (e.g., low-flow water fixtures, water efficient irrigation, etc.).

LRDP MM GHG-1d: UC Davis shall implement transportation reduction measures in accordance with the UC Policy on Sustainable Practices and the UC Davis CAP.

- For all campus-owned fleet vehicles, old equipment scheduled for retirement shall be preferentially replaced with fuel efficient, low emission vehicles (LEV), zero-emission vehicles (ZEV), and/or alternative-fueled vehicles consistent with the needs of the campus.
- UC Davis shall investigate ways to expand or further improve upon the Green Light Commuter Club by providing additional alternative transportation options and incentives, and shall educate students, staff, faculty, and visitors about the program.
- UC Davis shall implement campus-wide policies and programs for reducing vehicle and flight miles traveled through teleconferencing, telecommuting, and telemedicine and shall educate students, staff, faculty, and visitors about these policies and programs.
- UC Davis shall pursue the expansion of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs and projects to reduce the environmental impacts from commuting. TDM programs may include: carshare, carpools (rideshare), vanpools, buspools, campus shuttles, transit, bicycle circulation system, pedestrian circulation system, emergency rides home, telecommuting, flexible schedules, parking management (amount, access, fees), etc. In conjunction with this effort, campuses will engage in advocacy efforts with local transit districts to improve routes in order to better serve student and staff ridership. UC Davis shall educate students, staff, faculty, and visitors about TDM programs.

LRDP MM GHG-1e: UC Davis shall implement further waste reduction and recycling actions to reduce overall contributions to the campus landfill. Waste reduction and recycling actions shall include new purchasing requirements to increase recycled content in consumable materials and improved requirements for purchasing recyclable materials where possible.

LRDP MM GHG-1f: UC Davis shall monitor and report the total annual GHG emissions on a biannual basis. If the total annual increase in emissions from the project exceeds 25,000 MTCO₂e in

2014 and/or 2020, UC Davis shall buy renewable energy credits, offsets, and/or allowances in accordance with the UC Policy on Sustainable Practices and/or a future cap-and-trade program to reduce the new emissions to below 25,000 MTCO₂e.

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP would generate GHG emissions. Mitigation Measure GHG-1 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

5. Noise

Impact NOI-2 Campus construction activities under the 2010 LRDP could expose some receptors to excessive ground vibration.

MM NOI-2. For construction adjacent to off-site residential uses, advance notice will be given to occupants of these uses to ensure that precautions are taken to protect ongoing activities from vibration effects.

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP could expose some receptors to excessive ground vibration. Mitigation Measure NOI-2 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

Impact NOI-4 The operation of mechanical equipment at the Central Plant and new buildings at the Sacramento campus could result in a substantial long-term increase in ambient noise levels.

MM NOI-4. Mechanical equipment and building design shall be selected so that noise levels from future building and other facility operations would not exceed the Noise Ordinance limits of the City of Sacramento for commercial areas or residential zones as measured on any noise sensitive receptor in the area surrounding the Sacramento campus. Controls that would typically be incorporated to attain adequate noise reduction would include selection of quiet equipment, sound attenuators on fans, sound attenuator packages for cooling towers and emergency generators, acoustical screen walls, and equipment enclosures.

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP would could result in a substantial long-term increase in ambient noise levels. Mitigation Measure NOI-4 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

6. Utilities and Service Systems

Impact UTIL-5 The project would generate additional demand for wastewater treatment. The wastewater treatment provider, the City of Sacramento, has sufficient capacity to serve the project's projected demand.

MM UTIL-5. The University will pay its proportional share of the cost of environmental mitigation measures that are required in association with SRWTP expansion.

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP would generate additional demand for wastewater treatment. Mitigation Measure UTIL-5 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

D. LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS WITH RECOMMENDED MITIGATION

The Final EIR identifies the following less-than-significant impacts of the Project. While not required by CEQA, the following mitigation measures will further reduce these less-than-significant impacts and are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project.

1. *Aesthetics.*

Impact AES-1: *Implementation of the 2010 LRDP would alter but would not substantially degrade the existing visual character and quality of the UC Davis Sacramento Campus site and its surroundings.*

MM AES-1. The University will install landscaping within the 40-foot landscape buffer adjacent to new specific projects that are approved. Installation would occur within one year of the development of the new projects.

Impact AES-2: *Implementation of the 2010 LRDP would create new sources of light and glare that would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.*

MM AES-2. LRDP MM AES-2a: Design for specific projects shall provide for the use of textured non-reflective exterior surfaces and non-reflective glass.

LRDP MM AES-2b: Except as provided in LRDP Mitigation Measure AES-2c, all new outdoor lighting shall utilize directional lighting methods with shielded and cutoff type light fixtures to minimize glare and upward directed lighting.

LRDP MM AES-2c: 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 Facilities Planning, Design and Construction staff 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.

LRDP MM AES-2d: The University will implement the use of the specific lighting design and equipment when older lighting fixtures and designs are replaced over time.

2. *Biological Resources*

Impact BIO-1: *Implementation of the 2010 LRDP would not have a substantial adverse effect on the valley elderberry longhorn beetle.*

MM BIO-1. Prior to any project-related activities that could indirectly affect or require the removal of the elderberry shrubs in the central campus major open space, the University will consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to determine the appropriate actions that must be taken to avoid an inadvertent adverse effect on VELB or potential VELB habitat, including surveys to determine if VELB is present. Any required replacement and/or transplanting of elderberry shrubs shall occur as directed by the USFWS and as outlined in the Conservation Guidelines for the Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle (USFWS 1999).

3. Land Use and Planning

Impact LU-2: *The proposed 2010 LRDP would not result in development that would conflict with existing and future adjacent land uses.*

MM LU-2. Prior to design approval for or authorization to proceed with development projects located along the campus boundary, the University will review project siting and design to ensure that the project conforms to LRDP height limits.

E. SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS AND RELATED MITIGATION MEASURES

Where a public agency identifies significant environmental effects of a project that cannot feasibly be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the agency is permitted to approve the project nevertheless if it finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment. This written finding pertaining to the significant and unavoidable impacts of the Project, known as a “Statement of Overriding Considerations,” is found in Section III, below.

The Final EIR identifies the following significant unavoidable adverse impacts associated with the approval of the Project. For a detailed description of these impacts and mitigation measures, please see appropriate references in the Final EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring Program.

1. Air Quality

Impact AIR-1: *Construction projects under the 2010 LRDP could result in construction emissions that violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.*

MM AIR-1. LRDP MM AIR-1a: For each construction project on the campus, the project contractor will implement the following PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} control measures, as appropriate:

- Water exposed soil with adequate frequency to minimize fugitive dust. However, the contractor shall not overwater to the extent that sediment flows off the site.
- Suspend excavation, grading, and/or demolition activity when wind speeds exceed 20 mph.
- Install wind breaks (e.g., solid fencing) on windward side(s) of construction areas.
- Plant vegetative ground cover in disturbed areas as soon as possible. Water appropriately until vegetation is established.
- Prevent soil from leaving the construction site (e.g., install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off all trucks as equipment leaving the site; Treat site accesses to a distance of 100 feet from the paved road with a 6 to 12-inch layer of wood chips, mulch, or gravel to reduce generation of road dust carryout onto public roads.)
- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The phone number of the District shall also be visible to ensure compliance.

LRDP MM AIR-1b: For each construction project on the campus, the University shall require that the project include a construction emissions control plan that includes a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 horsepower, that will be used for an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of the construction project. The inventory shall include the horsepower rating, engine production year, and projected hours of use for each piece of equipment. The inventory shall be updated monthly throughout the duration of the project as needed, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The plan will also include the anticipated construction timeline including start date, and name and phone number of the project manager and on-site foreman. The plan will also demonstrate that the heavy-duty (> 50 horsepower) self-propelled off road equipment to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project-wide fleet-average 20 percent NOX reduction or greater and 45 percent particulate reduction or greater compared to the most recent CARB fleet average at the time of project construction. The University shall retain a copy of the construction emissions control plan on the campus, which will be made available to the agencies and the public upon request.

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP could result in a violation of air quality standards. Mitigation Measure AIR-1 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of these mitigation measures will reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level; therefore, implementation of the 2010 LRDP may result in impacts that are significant but unavoidable. The Regents find this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the Project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the Project.

Cumulative Impact AIR-1: *Implementation of the 2010 LRDP would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.*

MM Cumulative AIR-1. The University will work with SACOG to ensure that campus growth is accounted for in the regional population and employment projections so that the emissions associated with campus growth can be accounted for in the regional air quality plans.

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP could result in a violation of air quality standards. Mitigation Measure Cumulative AIR-1 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of these mitigation measures will reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level; therefore, implementation of the 2010 LRDP may result in impacts that are significant but unavoidable. The Regents find this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the Project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the Project.

2. Biological Resources

Impact BIO-3: *Implementation of the 2010 LRDP could result in a conflict with a local policy or ordinance protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.*

MM BIO-3. LRDP MM BIO-3a: Before a project is approved under the 2010 LRDP, the University will determine whether a heritage tree (any tree with a circumference of 100 inches and in good health or a native tree species with a circumference of 36 inches or greater and in good health) is present on the site. If a heritage tree is present within the development footprint, the University will modify project design to avoid the heritage tree if feasible.

LRDP MM BIO-3b: If avoidance is not feasible, the University will replace the tree with the same species or species of comparable value at a ratio of 3:1.

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP could result in a conflict with a local policy or ordinance protecting biological resources. Mitigation Measure BIO-3 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of these mitigation measures will reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level; therefore, implementation of the 2010 LRDP may result in impacts that are significant but unavoidable. The Regents find this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the Project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the Project.

Cumulative Impact BIO-1: *Implementation of the 2010 LRDP would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact on special status species or their habitat but would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulative loss of heritage trees in the region.*

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP could result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to the cumulative loss of heritage trees in the region.

Mitigation Measures BIO-3a and Bio-3b are hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of these mitigation measures will reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level; moreover, the University cannot control the actions of neighboring jurisdictions with regard to preservation of heritage trees; therefore, implementation of the 2010 LRDP may result in impacts that are significant but unavoidable. The Regents find this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the Project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the Project.

3. Cultural Resources

Impact CUL-1: *Implementation of the 2010 LRDP could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.*

MM CUL-1. LRDP MM CUL-1a: Before altering or otherwise affecting a building or structure 50 years of age or older, the University shall retain a qualified architectural historian to record it on a California Department of Parks and Recreation DPR 523 form or equivalent documentation. Its significance shall be assessed by a qualified architectural historian, using the significance criteria set forth for historic resources under *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.5. The evaluation process shall include the development of appropriate historical background research as context for the assessment of the significance of the structure in the history of the campus and the region.

LRDP MM CUL-1b: For a building or structure that qualifies as a historic resource, the architectural historian and the University shall consult to consider measures that would enable the project to avoid direct or indirect impacts to the building or structure. These could include preserving a building on the margin of the project site, using it “as is,” or other measures that would not alter the building. If alteration of a historic building or structure cannot be reasonably avoided, necessary alterations shall be carried out in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Section 15126.4(b)(1)). If the removal of a historic building or structure cannot be avoided, the University shall ensure that a qualified architectural historian thoroughly documents the building and associated landscaping and setting. Documentation shall include still and video photography and a written documentary record of the building to the standards of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) or Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), including accurate scaled mapping, architectural descriptions, and scaled architectural plans, if available.

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.. Mitigation Measures CUL-1 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level; therefore, implementation of the 2010 LRDP may result in impacts that are significant but unavoidable. The Regents find this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the Project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the Project.

Cumulative Impact CUL-1: *Development under the 2010 LRDP would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative damage to and loss of the resource base of unique archaeological and historical resources (including archaeological sites and historic buildings and structures) in Sacramento County.*

MM Cumulative CUL-1. No mitigation measures other than the mitigation measures listed under LRDP Impacts CUL-1 through CUL-3 are available.

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP could result in make a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative damage to and loss of the resource base of unique archaeological and historical resources (including archaeological sites and historic buildings and structures) in Sacramento County. Mitigation Measure Cumulative CUL-1 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level; therefore, implementation of the 2010 LRDP may result in impacts that are significant but unavoidable. The Regents find this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the Project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the Project.

4. Noise

Impact NOI-1: *Construction activities under the 2010 LRDP would expose existing off-site and on-site receptors to elevated noise levels.*

MM NOI-1. The following mitigation measures are proposed to reduce noise generated by demolition and construction activities:

- Erect temporary noise control blanket barriers in a manner to shield adjacent off-campus residences and on-campus occupied facilities at the perimeter of construction staging areas, at the perimeter of ground clearing, excavation, or demolition sites, and at elevated construction sites (i.e., multistory buildings). When feasible, barriers will be erected at or near the work site itself to provide the most noise attenuation.
- Where construction is adjacent to on-site or off-site sensitive receptors, construct a noise barrier 8 to 10 feet in height at the project site perimeter that will break the line-of-sight between construction equipment and noise receptors, where feasible.
- Limit significant noise-generating construction activities, including truck traffic coming to and from the site for any purpose, to the hours of 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM Monday through Saturday, and 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM on Sundays and Holidays.
- Properly muffle and maintain all construction equipment powered by internal combustion engines.
- Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.

- Locate all stationary noise-generating construction equipment, such as air compressors and cranes, as far as practical from existing nearby residences and other noise-sensitive land uses. Acoustically shield such equipment.
- Select quiet construction equipment, particularly air compressors, whenever possible. (Fit motorized equipment with proper mufflers in good working order).
- Minimize construction traffic along V Street.
- The Government and Community Relations office will be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The office would determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and would require that reasonable measures warranted to correct the problem be implemented. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the office at the construction site and include it in the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule.

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP would expose existing off-site and on-site receptors to elevated noise levels. Mitigation Measure NOI-1 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level; therefore, implementation of the 2010 LRDP may result in impacts that are significant but unavoidable. The Regents find this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the Project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the Project.

5. Transportation and Traffic

Impact TRA-1: *Development envisioned under the proposed 2010 LRDP would contribute to sub-standard intersection operations at 16 intersections, in the AM peak hour, the PM peak hour or both peak hours.*

MM TRA-1. The Campus Traffic Mitigation Program (CCTMP) is a multi-component program to monitor trip generation, reduce peak-hour trips to the extent feasible, and/or participate in roadway improvements to mitigate off-site impacts at the intersections affected by the proposed project. Development of on-campus housing as a means of reducing vehicle trips to the campus is not included in the CCTMP as a mitigation measure, but is evaluated as an alternative in **Section 5.0, Alternatives**, of this EIR. Each component of this program is described below.

LRDP MM TRA-1a: Travel Demand Management. To reduce on- and off-campus vehicle trips and resulting impacts, the University will enhance its Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program. TDM strategies will include measures to increase transit and shuttle use, encourage alternative transportation modes including bicycle transportation, implement parking policies that reduce demand, and other mechanisms that reduce vehicle trips to and from the campus. The University will work to achieve at least a 3 percent improvement in the mode split of daytime staff from the current 88 percent SOV/12 percent other modes. Trip reduction targets for students will be higher with approximately 15 to 20 percent traveling by other modes. The University shall monitor the performance of campus TDM strategies through annual surveys.

LRDP MM TRA-1b: Transit Enhancement. To enhance transit systems serving the campus, the University will work cooperatively with Sacramento Regional Transit, and other local agencies to coordinate service routes with existing and proposed shuttle and transit programs.

LRDP MM TRA-1c: Sustainability and Monitoring. The University shall review individual projects proposed under the 2010 LRDP for consistency with UC sustainable transportation policy and UC Davis Sacramento Campus TDM strategies to ensure that bicycle and pedestrian improvements, alternative fuel infrastructure, transit stops, and other project features that promote alternative transportation are incorporated into each project to the extent feasible.

LRDP MM TRA-1d: Campus Traffic Impact Monitoring. The University will conduct traffic counts at key gateway locations on the campus every five years to determine the amount of traffic generated by the campus.

LRDP MM TRA-1e: Mitigation Payments. The University's proportional share of the cost of the roadway improvements in **Table 4.13-14** is determined by dividing projected LRDP-related trips by the increase in background traffic between existing conditions and 2025. The projected proportional share percentage of each improvement is provided in **Table 4.13-14**, but the University's actual share will be determined based on actual project trips as established by monitoring under LRDP **Mitigation Measure TRA-1d**. It is anticipated that at the time that the City proposes an improvement at an affected intersection and requests a proportional share payment, the University's proportional share will be calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Campus Proportional Share \% of mitigation project contribution from EIR} = \frac{\text{(calculated traffic growth in year X)}}{\text{projected LRDP traffic growth in 2025}} \times \text{impact}$$

Where:

X = the year the mitigation project is constructed

Traffic growth in year X = gateway counts in year X - gateway counts in LRDP base year

Projected LRDP traffic growth in 2025 = 2025 LRDP gateway forecasts from EIR - gateway counts in LRDP base year

Payments will be made to the City/Caltrans at the time that the improvements are programmed and no later than the start of construction or when implementation of the improvement is reasonably certain.

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP would contribute to sub-standard intersection operations at 16 intersections, in the AM peak hour, the PM peak hour or both peak hours. Mitigation Measure TRA-1 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level; therefore, implementation of the 2010 LRDP may result in impacts that are significant but unavoidable. The Regents find this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the Project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the Project.

Impact TRA-2: *Development envisioned under the proposed 2010 LRDP would contribute to sub-standard operations at freeway facilities.*

MM TRA-2. The University will implement **LRDP Mitigation Measures TRA-1a** through **1e** to reduce new trips to the maximum extent possible, monitor its trip generation, and contribute its proportional share of the cost of the improvements to the affected freeway mainline segment and ramps based on information in **Tables 4.13-17** and **4.13-18 of the LRDP EIR.**

FINDING: The Regents find that implementation of the 2010 LRDP would contribute to sub-standard operations at freeway facilities. Mitigation Measure TRA-2 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Project. Implementation of this mitigation measure will reduce this impact, but not to a less-than-significant level; therefore, implementation of the 2010 LRDP may result in impacts that are significant but unavoidable. The Regents find this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the Project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the Project.

G. ALTERNATIVES

Chapter 5 of the EIR evaluated a range of reasonable alternatives to the 2010 LRDP. In compliance with CEQA and CEQA Guidelines, the alternatives analysis included an analysis of a No Project Alternative and identified the environmentally superior alternative. The analysis examined the feasibility of each alternative, the environmental impacts of each alternative, and the ability of each alternative to meet the project objectives identified in section 5.2 of the FEIR. Table 5.0-1 in the EIR compares the environmental impacts of the proposed project and each of the alternatives.

The Regents certify that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on alternatives provided in the Final EIR and the administrative record, and finds that all the alternatives are “infeasible” as that term is defined by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines for the reasons set forth below.

1. Project Objectives

The Regents find that the objectives for the 2010 LRDP are as described in Section 3 of the EIR. The overall purpose of the proposed 2010 LRDP is to provide a physical framework to support the goals of the campus’s UC Davis Health System Strategic Plan. The fundamental goal of the UC Davis Sacramento Campus 2010 LRDP is to carefully continue the growth of this major medical facility. This goal is reflective not only of UC Davis’s desire to excel and grow as a top-tier research and academic university but also the University of California’s broader mission of teaching, research, and public service excellence.

The basic objectives of the 2010 LRDP are as follows:

- The UC Davis Health System serves approximately 6.1 million residents in 33 counties encompassing 65,000 square miles in Northern and Central California. The population of the 33-county service area is projected to grow to 8.1 million by 2025. Additional inpatient and outpatient capacity are needed to meet community health care needs as the population in the service area grows. Furthermore, in view of the growing and aging regional population, there is a need for more health care providers, including doctors and nurses, in this portion of California and throughout the state.
- In addition, to continue to support its teaching and research missions, the UC Davis Health System Strategic Plan identifies focus areas for research, including cancer, neuroscience, infectious disease, and vascular disease, and identifies goals for successful program implementation.
- Additionally, some of the UC Davis Health System research programs and functions are located off site, which hinders collaboration and intellectual exchange. Finally, some existing buildings require replacement and as other buildings age, those will require replacement.
- Physical development on the Sacramento campus is needed to address all of these needs identified above. The proposed 2010 LRDP would continue the Campus' planning tradition of identifying general types and locations of campus development and land uses to support new research and educational initiatives, and ongoing development and expansion of the clinical enterprise. The underlying objective for the 2010 LRDP is to create a framework that helps enhance the quality of the Sacramento campus environment while providing the flexibility to support program expansion over the next 15 years to address the needs identified above.

The specific objectives of the 2010 LRDP are to:

- provide additional state-of-the-art inpatient and outpatient capacity to keep pace with community health care needs and to support the UC Davis Health System's teaching, research and community engagement missions;
- facilitate growth in medical student enrollment and the implementation of major educational initiatives, such as the School of Nursing and the School of Public Health in order to address the existing and projected need for more doctors, nurses, and other medical staff in the state of California;
- provide the facilities and infrastructure required to facilitate continued growth of the research enterprise at the Sacramento campus, especially in order to foster interaction and collaboration between the researchers and clinical practitioners in the teaching hospital and ambulatory care facilities;
- address the constraints to intellectual exchange and collaboration resulting from the dispersed off-site locations of some of the UC Davis Health System programs; and
- address seismic and other code-related deficiencies in aging buildings, replacing them with state of the art facilities for health care and health-care related research.

2. Alternatives to the Proposed 2010 LRDP

The EIR evaluated four alternatives to the proposed Project: Alternative 1: Reduced Growth Alternative; Alternative 2: Alternative Land Use Plan; Alternative 3: On-Site Housing Alternative; Alternative 4: No Project Alternative

Alternative 1: Reduced Growth

Under the Reduced Growth Alternative, on-site daily population would increase from 12,499 in 2008–2009 to 15,000 persons by 2025, compared to an on-site daily population of 19,719 persons under the 2010 LRDP, an approximately 25 percent reduction compared to the proposed project. As a result of the reduced daily population, the amount of new development would also be reduced compared to the proposed project. In comparison to the proposed project, the alternative would decrease the proposed daily population growth for 2025 conditions by about 4,720 persons and would reduce building space by 1.64 million gsf. All other aspects of the proposed LRDP, including the land use plan, would be the same.

FINDING: The Regents find that the Reduced Growth Alternative is infeasible and is hereby rejected. The Reduced Growth Alternative is inferior to the Project as proposed because, while the Reduced Enrollment Alternative would result in decreased significant and unavoidable impacts to biological and cultural resources as well as decreased significant and unavoidable impacts to noise and traffic levels it would fail to meet the project objectives of improving and increasing physical development to serve the growing regional population. The comparison of all project impacts to this alternative is summarized in Table 5.0-1 of the EIR. This alternative would reduce medical student enrollment or eliminate/reduce major educational initiatives, such as the School of Nursing and the School of Public Health – which in turn would not increase nurses and other medical staff in the state of California. The Reduced Growth Alternative would not meet the project objectives because it would not facilitate continued growth of the research enterprise or foster interaction and collaboration between the researchers and clinical practitioners in the teaching hospital and ambulatory care facilities.

Alternative 2: Alternative Land Use Plan

Under the Alternative Land Use Plan Alternative, most aspects of the proposed 2010 LRDP would be implemented. Similar to the proposed 2025 LRDP, the alternative would accommodate development of up to 6.57 million gsf on the campus and a daytime population of up to 20,000 people. The alternative would however modify the land use plan in comparison to the proposed project by replacing the proposed Hospital uses at the northwestern corner of the campus with Education and Research uses, and designating a portion of the Education and Research area along Stockton Boulevard for Hospital uses. Specifically, the area of campus east of Stockton Boulevard, south of 2nd Avenue, and north of Building 41 (the Stockton Boulevard Research Center) would be designated for Hospital uses. All new hospital buildings would be constructed in this area, including any new patient bed towers, diagnostic and support services. The northwestern corner of the campus that is designated for Hospital uses in the 2010 LRDP would instead be designated for Education and Research uses. Prior to construction of education and research facilities, the older portions of the existing hospital, including the North/South Wing and East Wing, would be demolished over the course of 20 years. The newer sections of the hospital, including the University Tower, Davis Tower, and Pavilion, would remain.

FINDING: The Regents find that the Alternative Land Use Plan Alternative is infeasible and is hereby rejected. The Alternative Land Use Plan Alternative is inferior to the Project as proposed because while the Alternative Land Use plan would result in decreased significant and unavoidable impacts to biological resources and noise levels, the overall impacts would be approximately the same as the proposed project. The Alternative Land Use Plan alternative would result in increased impacts as compared to the proposed project for impacts in air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and utilities. The Alternative Land Use Plan alternative would result in decreased impacts as compared to the proposed project for impacts in cultural resources and noise. . The comparison of all project impacts to this alternative is summarized in Table 5.0-1 of the EIR. The Reduced Enrollment Alternative would fail to meet project objectives enhancing the quality of necessary facilities and improving collaboration throughout the campus because the alternative would require construction of a second hospital facility south of 2nd Avenue and operating two hospitals instead of one. To achieve the project objective of enhancing the quality of necessary facilities requires that the new facilities allow for and promote collaborations among multiple disciplines and the separate facilities would prevent such collaboration.

Alternative 3: On-Site Housing Alternative

The On-Site Housing Alternative would construct 200 units of housing on approximately 10 acres of land on the campus, to house faculty, staff, and students. The area designated for Education and Research south of X Street and east of Stockton Boulevard and the Ambulatory Care area near the MIND Institute under the proposed 2010 LRDP would be designated for residential use under this alternative.

The addition of housing would increase the overall building space in comparison to the proposed project such that building space would be greater than 6.57 million gsf. To compensate for the land taken from Education and Research and Ambulatory Care uses and assigned to housing (land that would have provided about 745,000 GSF of education and research space and about 100,000 GSF of future clinical/research space east of MIND Institute), this alternative would increase the intensity of building development in the remaining areas designated for Education and Research and Ambulatory Care in comparison with the proposed 2010 LRDP. The height limits of the structures in the Ambulatory Care District would need to be increased from five stories to eight stories in order to accommodate the same amount of building space as the proposed project. The heights of structures in the Education and Research areas would need to be increased from 2 to 5 stories to 10 to 12 stories in order to accommodate a similar amount of building space as the proposed project. However, such buildings would not be economically or programmatically reasonable, and even if such buildings could be constructed, the land area would not be large enough to accommodate as much Education and Research building space as the proposed project.

Also it is anticipated that there would be less landscaped areas throughout the Education and Research and Ambulatory Care Districts because buildings would need to be closer together. Development in the Hospital and the Support areas, setback area along the northern and eastern perimeter, and central campus major open space area, would be similar to the proposed 2010 LRDP.

Population on the campus would increase under this alternative because the housing would add family members of staff, faculty, and students to the on-site population.

FINDING: The Regents find that the On-Site Housing Alternative is infeasible and is hereby rejected. The On-Site Housing Alternative is inferior to the Project as proposed because, while the Alternative would result in fewer commuter trips to campus, the overall transportation expected impacts would be similar to the proposed project because household members living within the campus would result in daily trips to a from the campus and the significant and unavoidable transportation impacts of the proposed project would not be eliminate with this alternative. All significant and unavoidable impacts indentified in the proposed project would also occur under the On-Site Housing alternative. Additionally, some of these impacts such as construction project air emissions, impacts to heritage trees, and noise level impacts would be worse under the On-Site Housing Alternative. The comparison of all project impacts to this alternative is summarized in Table 5.0-1 of the EIR. In addition, the On-Site Housing Alternative would result in less landscaped areas than the proposed project and the land area would not be large enough to accommodate as much Education and Research building space as the proposed project. The reduction in Education and Research building space would decrease the potential enrollment of medical students and decrease the amount of research that could be accommodated. Accordingly, the On-Site Housing Alternative would not meet the objectives of providing the necessary physical space to expand medical education and research. the

Alternative 4: No Project Alternative

State CEQA Guidelines require a consideration of the No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative would essentially mean that even though the 2010 LRDP would not be adopted, the campus would continue to grow. The Sacramento Campus would propose development on a project-by-project basis, though such development would not have the benefit of sound land use planning that is provided by an LRDP. Even though new building space would be constructed on a project-by-project basis, it is anticipated that ultimately under the No Project Alternative, building space and population on the campus would increase to the same levels as it would under the 2010 LRDP.

FINDING: The Regents find that the No Project Alternative is infeasible and is hereby rejected. The No Project Alternative is inferior to the Project as proposed because, while the No Project Alternative would result in the same level of impacts for many impact categories as compared to the proposed Project, it would result in increased impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, and noise levels as compared to the proposed project. The comparison of all project impacts to this alternative is summarized in Table 5.0-1 of the EIR. This alternative would result in the provision new physical space to meet enrollment, research, and hospital needs however, the No Project Alternative would not provide the benefit of a plan to guide the campus in achieving its objectives and may result in land development that does not optimize the use of available land and infrastructure. Other benefits that result from a site-wide, programmatic approach to mitigation for traffic, air quality, and greenhouse gas impacts would also not be realized.

Alternative 5: No Growth Alternative

No Growth Alternative is another form of the No Project Alternative, which assumes that if the 2010 LRDP were not to be approved, all future development on the campus would stop and no new building space and no new daily population would be added to the campus. Existing buildings, including those that are seismically or otherwise code deficient or those that are at the end of their useful lives, could be replaced with newer facilities, so long as the overall building space remains the same or less than under existing conditions and there is no increase in campus population.

FINDING: The Regents find that the No Growth Alternative is infeasible and is hereby rejected. The No Growth Alternative would reduce impacts in all categories as compared to the proposed Project and it would eliminate significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality, biological resources, and transportation as compared to the proposed project. The comparison of all project impacts to this alternative is summarized in Table 5.0-1 of the EIR. While these project impacts would be reduced or eliminated, this alternative would not allow growth of building space or population on the Sacramento campus and would not meet any of the University's objectives for providing additional inpatient and outpatient capacity, providing facilities and infrastructure to facilitate the research enterprise, and facilitating growth in medical student enrollment and the implementation of major educational initiatives.

Other Proposed Alternatives

FINDING: The Regents further find that with respect to alternatives that were suggested in comments on the Draft EIR, the Responses to Comments explain that the suggested alternatives are infeasible and thus are not recommended for further study or adoption. The Regents hereby adopt and incorporate by reference the reasons stated in the Responses to Comments as the grounds for finding these suggested alternatives to be infeasible.

3. *Environmentally Superior Alternative*

FINDING: The Regents find that while the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative because it would avoid many of the significant environmental impacts of the development that would occur under the proposed 2010 LRDP, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires that if the environmentally superior alternative is the no project alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Therefore, the environmentally superior alternative, excepting the No Project Alternative, is the Reduced Growth Alternative. The Reduced Growth Alternative would incrementally reduce development, thereby reducing impacts such as traffic, water and air quality compared to the proposed Project. Because neither the No Project Alternative nor the Reduced Growth Alternative meet the project objectives, however, the University would be required to develop alternative solutions to meet anticipated increases in demand for teaching, research, and clinical facilities, which would result in impacts that cannot be known at this time. The Reduced Growth Alternative would reduce medical student enrollment or eliminate/reduce major educational initiatives, such as the School of Nursing and the School of Public Health – which in turn would not increase nurses and other medical staff in the state of California. The Reduced Growth Alternative would not meet the project objectives because it would not facilitate continued

growth of the research enterprise or foster interaction and collaboration between the researchers and clinical practitioners in the teaching hospital and ambulatory care facilities.

The Regents further find that of the remaining alternatives evaluated in this Final EIR, each has varying levels of impacts on different environmental resources as discussed above, and none is superior to the others for CEQA purposes. When compared to the other alternatives analyzed in the Final EIR, the 2010 LRDP provides the best available balance between maximizing attainment of the project objectives and minimizing significant environmental impacts, and is the environmentally superior alternative among the remaining alternatives.

III. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

A. Impacts that Remain Significant

As discussed above, The Regents have found that the following impacts of the 2010 LRDP remain significant, either in whole or in part, following adoption and implementation of the mitigation measures described in the Final EIR:

Environmental Impact Area	Impact
Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction emissions may violate air quality standards (see EIR, Section 4.2.4.4, Impact AIR-1) • Cumulative increase in non-attainment pollutants (see EIR Section 4.2.4.5, Impact AIR-1)
Biological Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of the 2010 LRDP could result in a conflict with a local policy or ordinance protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (see EIR Section 4.3.4.4, Impact BIO-3) • Cumulatively considerable contribution to the loss of heritage trees in the region (see EIR Section 4.3.4.5, Cumulative Impact BIO-1)
Cultural Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource (see EIR Section 4.4.4.3, Impact CUL-1) • Cumulatively considerable loss of archaeological and historical resources (see EIR Section 4.4.4.4, Cumulative Impact CUL-1)
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction activities would expose existing off-site and on-site receptors to elevated noise levels (see EIR Section 4.10.4.2, Impact NOI-1)
Transportation and Circulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions to sub-standard intersection operations (see EIR Section 4.13.4.4, Impact TRA-1) • Contributions to sub-standard operations at freeway facilities (see EIR Section 4.13.4.4, Impact TRA-2)

B. Overriding Considerations

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, The Regents have, in determining whether or not to approve the Project, balanced the economic, social, technological and other benefits of the project against its unavoidable environmental risks, and have found that the benefits of the project outweigh the significant adverse environmental effects that are not mitigated to less-than-significant levels, for the reasons set forth below. This statement of overriding considerations is based on The Regents' review of the Final EIR and other information in the administrative record, including but not limited to the 2010 LRDP. The benefits of the Project include the following:

1) The UC Davis Health System serves approximately 6.1 million residents in 33 counties encompassing 65,000 square miles in Northern and Central California. The population of the 33-county service area is projected to grow to 8.1 million by 2025. Additional inpatient and outpatient capacity are needed to meet community health care needs as the population in the service area grows. Furthermore, in view of the growing and aging regional population, there is a need for more health care providers, including doctors and nurses, in this portion of California and throughout the state. The UC Davis Health System provides a number of unique services in terms of treatment and expertise and the need for those unique services is expected to grow as the regional population increases.

As the physical planning framework to implement the goals of the UC Davis Health System Strategic Plan, the 2010 LRDP will provide a growth plan to improve the efficiency and sustainability of the UC Davis Sacramento Campus and meet the physical development needs for a growing population.

2) The 2010 LRDP will strengthen the campus physical appearance through the implementation of formal open space areas that will serve as pedestrian corridors and will enhance the appeal of the campus as a top-tier medical institution. The improved physical appearance of the campus will enhance recruiting efforts for new employees and will provide a more attractive and comforting environment for patients and visitors.

3) Implementation of the 2010 LRDP will help UC Davis address seismic and other code-related deficiencies in aging buildings, replacing them with state of the art facilities for health care and health-care related research.

4) The development of the 2010 LRDP will enable UC Davis to help the University of California fulfill its obligation to improve and expand access to higher education for the residents of the State of California.

Considering all factors, The Regents find that there are specific economic, legal, social, technological and other considerations associated with the Project that outweigh the Project's significant unavoidable effects, and that those significant adverse effects are therefore considered acceptable.

IV. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

The record of proceedings upon which The Regents base these findings consists of all the documents and evidence relied upon by UC Davis in preparing the proposed 2010 LRDP and the 2010 LRDP EIR. The custodian of the record of proceedings is: UC Davis, Office of Facilities, Design and Construction, Facilities Support Services Building, 4800 Second Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95817.

V. SUMMARY

Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, The Regents has made one or more of the following Findings with respect to the significant environmental effects of the proposed 2010 LRDP as described in the Final EIR:

- 1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects on the environment.
- 2) Changes or alterations that are wholly or partially within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other public agency.
- 3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible certain mitigation measures and alternatives.

Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, it is hereby determined that:

- 1) All significant effects on the environment due to approval of the 2010 LRDP have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.
- 2) Any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the factors described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section III, above.

VI. APPROVALS

The Regents hereby take the following actions:

A. The Regents certify the Final EIR, as described in Section I, above.

B. The Regents hereby adopt as conditions of approval of the 2010 LRDP all mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the University set forth in Section II of the Findings, above.

C. The Regents hereby adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project accompanying the Final EIR and discussed in Section III.F of the Findings, above.

D. The Regents hereby adopt the Findings in their entirety as set forth in Section II - V, above, including the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

E. Having certified the Final EIR, independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR, incorporated mitigation measures into the Project, and adopted the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and the foregoing Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Regents hereby approve and adopt the UC Davis Sacramento Campus 2010 Long Range Development Plan.