FINDINGS AND APPROVAL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DAVIS
ROBERT MONDAVI INSTITUTE FOR WINE AND FOOD SCIENCE

I. CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL EIR

The University of California (“University”), as lead agency, has certified the Final Environmental Impact Report for the 2003 Long Range Development Plan (“2003 LRDP”) for the University of California, Davis (“UC Davis” or “the campus”). The Final Environmental Impact Report (“Final EIR”) has been assigned State Clearinghouse No. 2002102092.

Volume III of 2003 LRDP Final EIR assesses the potential environmental effects of five projects proposed by UC Davis for implementation under the 2003 LRDP, including the Robert Mondavi Institute project. Volume IV of the 2003 LRDP Final EIR includes comments on the May 2003 Draft EIR submitted by interested public agencies, organizations and members of the public, and provides written responses to the environmental issues raised in those comments. The Final EIR is hereby incorporated in these findings by reference.

The Robert Mondavi Institute (RMI) project was planned to ultimately contain three components: (1) The Robert Mondavi Institute for Wine and Food Science (RMI Academic Building), (2) The Viticulture and Enology Research and Teaching Winery (Winery Building), and (3) The Anheuser-Busch Brewing and Food Science Laboratory (Laboratory Building). The 2003 LDRP Final EIR evaluated the combined impacts of all three components of the RMI Project. The project proposed for approval at this point is the first component, the RMI Academic Building.

Pursuant to Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 15090, the Board of Regents of the University of California (“The Regents”) certifies that it has been presented with the 2003 LRDP Final EIR and that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to making the following findings in Section II and approvals in Section III, below.

Based upon the foregoing, The Regents finds and determines that as the certified Environmental Impact Report for the 2003 LRDP, the Final EIR provides the basis for approval of the RMI Academic Building, and the supporting findings set forth in Sections II and III below.

II. FINDINGS

The Regents is adopting these findings for the entirety of the actions described in these findings and in the Final EIR as comprising the RMI Academic Building for UC Davis.

Having received, reviewed and considered the Final EIR and other information in the record of proceedings, The Regents hereby adopts the following findings pertaining to the RMI Academic Building in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the University’s procedures for implementing CEQA:

Part A: Findings regarding the environmental review process and the contents of the Final EIR.
Part B: Findings regarding impacts and disposition of related mitigation measures.

Part C: Findings regarding alternatives to the project and the reasons that such alternatives have been rejected.

Part D: Statement of Overriding Considerations determining that the benefits of the RMI Academic Building outweigh the significant and unavoidable environmental impacts that will result and therefore justify approval of the project despite such impacts.

The Regents certifies that these findings are based on full appraisal of all viewpoints, including all comments received up to the date of adoption of these findings, concerning the environmental issues identified and discussed in the Final EIR. The Regents has exercised its independent judgement and adopt these findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the approvals set forth in Section III, below.

A. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

1. Development of the Proposed RMI

   The RMI Project was proposed to provide a modern facility to accommodate the Food Science and Technology (FS&T) and Viticulture and Enology (V&E) departments (two departments within the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences), which currently are housed in Cruess Hall and the Enology Building. These buildings were constructed in 1952 and 1939, respectively, for agricultural programs that at the time had relatively simple laboratory needs. The facilities provided by these buildings are outdated, and the lack of modern science laboratories limits teaching and research opportunities and also limits collaboration efforts of the V&E and FS&T departments.

   In addition to outdated facilities, the amount of space available to the V&E and FS&T departments has not kept pace with modern teaching and research practices. Some research activities have not been pursued because of a lack of space. The typical size of a research team involved in biological science ranges from 10 to 12 individuals comprising faculty, post-doctoral scholars, graduate students, and undergraduate students. The lack of sufficient space hampers the appropriate involvement of these team members, and adversely affects the campus goal to engage more students in the research enterprise.

   The RMI Academic Building, which is the first component of the RMI Project, would be a modern three- to four-story research and instruction building with 129,600 gross square feet of space which would be shared by the FS&T and V&E departments and would serve as the headquarters for the Robert Mondavi Institute.
2. Absence of Changed Circumstances

CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15163 require a lead agency to prepare a subsequent EIR or a supplement to an EIR when substantial changes to the project are proposed which require changes to the previous EIR, or when substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances in which the project is undertaken which require changes to the previous EIR. No changes are proposed to the RMI Academic Building that was evaluated in the certified UC Davis 2003 LRDP Final EIR, and there have been no substantial changes to the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken. Based on the foregoing, The Regents hereby finds that preparation of a subsequent EIR or a supplement to the UC Davis 2003 LRDP Final EIR is not required.

B. IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

As stated in Section I above, the 2003 LDRP Final EIR evaluated the combined impacts of all three components of the RMI Project. The following section summarizes the environmental impacts of the RMI Academic Building, 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 RMI Academic Building, alternatives to the project, and the mitigation measures proposed by the Final EIR and adopted and incorporated by The Regents into the project.

These findings summarize the environmental determinations of the Final EIR about RMI Academic Building 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, 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 after imposition of 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 RMI Academic Building’s impacts. In making these findings, The Regents ratifies, adopts and incorporates the analysis and explanation in the Final EIR in these findings, and ratifies, adopts and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the Final EIR relating to mitigation measures and environmental impacts of the RMI Academic Building, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

As set forth in Part III, below, The Regents adopts and incorporates into the project, the mitigation measures set forth in these findings to reduce or avoid the potentially significant and significant impacts of the RMI Academic Building, as well as certain less-than-significant impacts. In adopting these mitigation measures, The Regents intends to adopt each of the mitigation measures proposed in the Final EIR which pertain to the RMI Academic Building. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR which pertains to the RMI Academic Building 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 fail 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.

1. **Aesthetics**

   a. **RMI Impact 5.4-1 Visual Character and Quality.** Implementation of the RMI would have a less-than-significant impact on visual character and quality.

      LRDP Mitigation 4.1-2(a) New structures, roads, and landscaping at UC Davis shall be designed to be compatible with those visual elements and policies identified in the 2003 LRDP.

      LRDP Mitigation 4.1-2(b) Prior to design approval of development projects under the 2003 LRDP, the Campus Design Review Committee must determine that project designs are consistent with the valued elements of the visual landscape identified in the 2003 LRDP, applicable planning guidelines, and/or the character of surrounding development so that the visual character and quality of the project area are not substantially degraded.

      **FINDING:** For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.1-2(a) and 4.1-2(b) will further reduce this less-than-significant impact on visual character.

   b. **RMI Impact 5.4-2 Light and Glare.** Development under the RMI would have a less-than-significant impact due to light and glare.

      LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(a) Design for specific projects shall provide for the use of textured nonreflective exterior surfaces and nonreflective glass.

      LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(b) Except as provided in LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(c), all new outdoor lighting shall utilize directional lighting methods with shielded and cutoff type light fixtures to minimize glare and upward directed lighting.

      LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(c) Non-cutoff, non-shielded lighting fixtures used to enhance nighttime views of walking paths, specific landscape features, or specific architectural features shall be reviewed by the Campus Design Review Committee prior to installation to ensure that: (1) the minimum amount of required lighting is proposed to achieve the desired nighttime emphasis, and (2) the proposed illumination creates no adverse effect on nighttime views.

      **FINDING:** For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.1-3(a), 4.1-3(b), and 4.1-3(c) will further reduce the less-than-significant impact associated with light and glare.

2. **Agricultural Resources**
a. **RMI Impact 5.4-3 Conversion of Prime Farmland.** Implementation of the RMI would have a significant impact on prime farmland.

**LRDP Mitigation 4.2-1** Prior to conversion of prime farmland to nonagricultural uses under the 2003 LRDP, the campus shall preserve approximately 525 acres of prime farmland at Russell Ranch, within the area designated for Teaching and Research Fields, or the Kidwell and McConeghy parcels for agricultural purposes (including agricultural teaching and research). The campus will preserve prime farmland at a one-to-one (1:1) mitigation ratio for prime farmland converted to developed uses and a one-third–to–one (1/3:1) ratio for prime farmland converted to habitat at Russell Ranch.

**FINDING:** For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.2-1 will reduce the overall effect of the project on prime farmland; however, this mitigation measure will not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.D of these findings.

3. **Air Quality**

a. **RMI Impact 5.4-4 Increased Air Emissions from Construction Activities.** The increase in air emissions from construction activities associated with the RMI is a significant impact.

**LRDP Mitigation 4.3-3(a)** The campus shall include in all construction contracts the measures specified below to reduce fugitive dust impacts, including but not limited to the following:

- All disturbed areas, including storage piles, which are not being actively utilized for construction purpose, shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water, chemical stabilizer/suppressant, or vegetative ground cover.
- All on-site unpaved roads and off-site unpaved access roads shall be effectively stabilized of dust emissions using water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.
- All land clearing, grubbing, scraping, excavation, land leveling, grading, cut and fill, and demolition activities shall be effectively controlled of fugitive dust emissions utilizing application of water or by presoaking.
- When demolishing buildings up to six stories in height, all exterior surfaces of the building shall be wetted during demolition.
- When materials are transported off-site, all material shall be covered, effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, or at least two feet of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained.
- All operations shall limit or expeditiously remove the accumulation of mud or dirt from adjacent public streets at least once every 24 hours when operations are occurring. The use of dry rotary brushes is expressly prohibited except where
preceded or accompanied by sufficient wetting to limit the visible dust emissions. Use of blower devices also is expressly forbidden.

- Following the addition of materials to, or the removal of materials from, the surface of outdoor storage piles, said piles shall be effectively stabilized of fugitive dust emissions by utilizing sufficient water or chemical stabilizer/suppressant.

**LRDP Mitigation 4.3-3(b)** The campus shall include in construction contracts for large construction projects near receptors, the following control measures:
- Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.
- Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than one percent.
- To the extent feasible, limit area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activity at any one time.

**LRDP Mitigation 4.3-3(c)** The campus shall implement the following control measures to reduce emissions of ozone precursors from construction equipment exhaust:
- To the extent that equipment is available and cost effective, the campus shall encourage contractors to use alternate fuels and retrofit existing engines in construction equipment.
- Minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes when construction equipment is not in use.
- To the extent practicable, manage operation of heavy-duty equipment to reduce emissions.
- To the extent practicable, employ construction management techniques such as timing construction to occur outside the ozone season of May through October, or scheduling equipment use to limit unnecessary concurrent operation.

**FINDING:** For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.3-3(a), 4.3-3(b), and 4.3-3(c) will reduce the severity of air emissions from construction activities associated with the RMI; however, the remaining emissions would still exceed the significance threshold. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.D of these findings.

**b. RMI Impact 5.4-5 Increased Air Emissions.** The increase in operational emissions from the RMI Project would not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING:** For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the operational emissions from the RMI Project is a less-than-significant impact; therefore no mitigation is required.
4. Biological Resources

a. **RMI Impact 5.4-9  Failure of Swainson’s Hawk Nesting Efforts.**

Implementation of the RMI could result in the failure of nesting efforts by Swainson’s hawk or other birds of prey. This is a potentially significant impact.

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

If any Swainson’s hawks are nesting within a one-half-mile radius of the project site or if other raptors are nesting in, on or adjacent to the project site, a qualified biologist shall determine the potential for disturbance to nesting raptors, including Swainson’s hawks. If the biologist determines that there is a significant potential for disturbance, the campus shall implement feasible changes in the construction schedule or make other appropriate adjustments to the project in response to the specific circumstances. If feasible project changes are not readily identifiable, the campus will consult with CDFG to determine what actions should be taken to protect the nesting efforts.

If after five years, a previously recorded nest site remains unoccupied by a Swainson’s hawk, it will no longer be considered as a Swainson’s hawk nest site subject to this mitigation.

**FINDING:** For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.4-4(a) will reduce the potentially significant impact associated with the failure of nesting efforts by Swainson’s hawks or other birds of prey to a less-than-significant level.

b. **RMI Impact 5.4-7  Impact on Wetlands.** Development of a new storm drain outfall for the RMI at the Arboretum waterway could result in the loss or adverse modification of natural wetlands or other waters of the U.S. This is a potentially significant impact.

**LRDP Mitigation 4.4-8(a)** During the project design phase, the campus shall conduct a wetlands delineation of the project site if wetlands are potentially present. The wetland delineation shall be verified by the ACOE.

Should no wetland habitats or natural drainages be delineated on the site then no further mitigation shall be required. However, if any jurisdictional wetland habitats or natural
drainages are delineated on a project site, then LRDP Mitigation 4.4-8(b) shall be required.

**LRDP Mitigation 4.4-8(b)** For projects that involve the fill of jurisdictional wetlands, the campus shall implement the following mitigation program that will ensure no net loss of wetland functions and values. To the extent feasible, the campus will avoid filling wetlands by redesigning the project to promote environmentally sensitive siting and design. If avoidance is not feasible, the campus shall minimize the fill acreage. If neither of these options is feasible, the wetlands will be mitigated for at a 3:1 ratio. This ratio will include both creation and preservation, with creation equaling at least a 1:1 ratio. To ensure no net loss of wetlands, the mitigation should include wetland enhancement as well. This would include monitoring, cleanup, and maintenance of preserved wetland habitats within and adjacent to the campus, as necessary.

**LRDP Mitigation 4.4-8(c)** The campus shall obtain the necessary ACOE, CDFG, and RWQCB permits prior to filling or other adverse modifications of any verified jurisdictional water of the U.S., or alteration, filling or modification of the channel, bed or bank of Putah Creek, South Fork of Putah Creek, Arboretum Waterway or any other natural drainage regulated under Section 16000 of the CDFG code.

**FINDING:** For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.4-8(a), 4.4-8(b), and 4.4-8(c) will reduce the potentially significant impact on wetlands to a less-than-significant level.

c. **RMI Impact 5.4-8 Impact on Northwestern Pond Turtle.** Development of a new storm drain outfall at the Arboretum waterway for the RMI could result in the temporary loss of potential habitat for the northwestern pond turtle. This is a potentially significant impact.

**LRDP Mitigation 4.4-7** The campus shall implement avoidance and minimization measures for the northwestern pond turtle, including but not limited to:
- Pre-construction surveys prior to any disturbance of the project site.
- Installation of silt fencing to prevent any pond turtles from entering the construction area.
- If work is performed in the water, seining of the area surrounding the site to relocate any northwestern pond turtles present.

**FINDING:** For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.4-7 will reduce the potentially significant impact on potential habitat for the northwestern pond turtle to a less-than-significant level.

5. **Cultural Resources**
a. RMI Impact 5.4-9 Damage or Destruction of an Archaeological Resource, Historic Building or Structure, or Disturb Human Remains. Construction of the RMI utility lines and other project facilities could damage or destroy an archaeological resource, historic structure, and/or disturb human remains. This is a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(b) During the planning phase of the project, the campus shall implement the following steps to identify and protect archaeological resources that may be present in the APE:

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

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

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

LRDP Mitigation 4.5-2(a) For an archaeological site that has been determined by a qualified archaeologist to qualify as an historical resource or a unique archaeological resource through the process set forth under LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(b), and where it has been determined under LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(b) that avoidance or preservation in place is not feasible, a qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the campus, shall:
(i) Prepare a research design and archaeological data recovery plan for the recovery that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant, and implement the data recovery plan prior to or during development of the site.

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

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

**LRDP Mitigation 4.5-2(b)** For a structure or building that has been determined by a qualified architectural historian to qualify as an historical resource through the process set forth under LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(c), and where it has been determined under LRDP Mitigation 4.5-1(c) that avoidance is not feasible, documentation and treatment shall be carried out as described below:

(i) If the building or structure can be preserved on site, but remodeling, renovation or other alterations are required, this work shall be conducted in compliance with the “Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings” (Weeks and Grimmer 1995).

(ii) If a significant historic building or structure is proposed for major alteration or renovation, or to be moved and/or demolished, the campus 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. A copy of the record shall be deposited with the University archives, Shields Library Special Collections. The record shall be accompanied by a report containing site-specific history and appropriate contextual information. This information shall be gathered through site specific and comparative archival research, and oral history collection as appropriate.
(iii) If preservation and reuse at the site are not feasible, the historical building shall be documented as described in item (ii) and, when physically and financially feasible, be moved and preserved or reused.

(iv) If, in the opinion of the qualified architectural historian, the nature and significance of the building is such that its demolition or destruction cannot be fully mitigated through documentation, the campus shall reconsider project plans in light of the high value of the resource, and implement more substantial modifications to the proposed project that would allow the structure to be preserved intact. These could include project redesign, relocation or abandonment. If no such measures are feasible, the campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation 4.5-3.

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

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

LRDP Mitigation 4.5-4(c) In the event of a discovery on campus of human bone, suspected human bone, or a burial, all excavation in the vicinity will halt immediately and the area of the find will be protected until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the bone is human. If the qualified archaeologist determines the bone is human, or if a qualified archaeologist is not present, the campus will notify the Yolo or Solano County Coroner (depending on the county of the find) of the find before additional disturbance occurs. If it is determined that the find is of Native American origin, the campus will comply with the provisions of PRC § 5097.98 regarding identification and involvement of the Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD).

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

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.5-1, 4.5-1(b)(i), (ii), and (vi), 4.5-2 (a and b), and 4.5-4(a-d) will reduce the potentially significant impact associated with damage
or destruction of an archaeological resource, a historic building or structure, and/or disturbance of human remains to a less-than-significant level.

b.  **RMI Impact 5.4-10 Diminish the Significance of a Historic Structure.** The Construction of the RMI utility lines would not diminish the significance of a historic structure. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**FINDING:** For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the construction of RMI utility lines will have a less-than-significant impact on a historic building or structure; therefore no mitigation is required.

6.  **Geology, Soils, and Seismicity**

**FINDING:** All RMI impacts associated with geology, soils, and seismicity were adequately addressed in the Final EIR. No project-specific mitigation is required.

7.  **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

a.  **RMI Impact 5.4-11 Increased Hazard to Public.** The RMI Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. This is a less-than-significant impact.

**LRDP Mitigation 4.7-1** The campus shall continue to implement the same (or equivalent) safety plans, programs, practices, and procedures related to the use, storage, and disposal of hazardous chemical materials during the 2003 LRDP planning horizon, including, but not necessarily limited to, the Business Plan, Hazardous Materials Communication Program, Chemical Inventory System, CUPA Self-Audit program, Injury and Illness Prevention Program, Chemical Hygiene Plans, Medical Surveillance Program, Chemical Safety Advisory Committee, Chemical Carcinogen Safety Program, and EH&S audits and safety training. These programs may be replaced by other programs that incorporate similar health and safety measures.

**LRDP Mitigation 4.7-2(a)** Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.7-1.

**LRDP Mitigation 4.7-2(b)** The campus shall continue to implement the same (or equivalent) hazardous waste management programs during the 2003 LRDP planning horizon, including, but not necessarily limited to, hazardous waste storage and handling procedures, the waste minimization program, the pretreatment program, and the Waste Exclusion Program. These programs may be subject to modification as more stringent standards are developed or if the programs become obsolete through replacement by other programs that incorporate similar health and safety protection measures.

**LRDP Mitigation 4.7-5(b)** The campus shall continue to implement the same (or equivalent) Biosafety Program during the 2003 LRDP planning horizon. This program may be subject to modification as more stringent standards are developed or if the
program becomes obsolete through replacement by other programs that incorporate similar health and safety protection measures.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-8 The campus shall continue to require that packaging of chemicals to be transported on public roads conform with all legal requirements.

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the RMI Project impact associated with hazards to the public or the environment through the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.7-1, 4.7-2, 4.7-5(b), and 4.7-8 will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

b. RMI Impact 5.4-12 Exposure to Contaminated Soil or Groundwater. The Construction activities under the RMI would not expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated soil or groundwater. This is a less-than-significant impact.

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for construction of the RMI Project to expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated soil or groundwater is a less-than-significant impact; therefore no mitigation is required.

8. Hydrology and Water Quality

a. RMI Impact 5.4-13 Impact of Construction Activities on Water Quality. RMI construction activities would not contribute substantial loads of sediment or other pollutants in storm water runoff that could degrade receiving water quality. This is a less-than-significant impact.

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

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the impact of RMI construction activities on receiving water quality is a less-than-significant impact. Implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.8-1 will further reduce this less-than-significant impact.

b. RMI Impact 5.4-14 Impact on Shallow/Intermediate and Deep Aquifers. Implementation of the RMI would increase the amount of water extracted from the shallow/intermediate and deep aquifers and would increase impervious surface. This could result in a net deficit in the aquifers or a lowering of the local groundwater table. This is a significant impact.
LRDP Mitigation 4.8-5(a) The campus shall continue to implement water conservation strategies to reduce demand for water from the deep aquifer. Domestic water conservation strategies shall include the following or equivalent measures:

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

(ii) Continue the leak detection and repair program.

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

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

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

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

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

LRDP Mitigation 4.8-6(a) The campus shall continue to implement water conservation strategies to reduce demand for water from the intermediate aquifer. Utility water conservation strategies shall include the following or equivalent measures:

(i) Landscape, where appropriate, with native, drought resistant plants and use lawns only where needed for pedestrian traffic, activity areas, and recreation.

(ii) Install efficient irrigation systems including centrally-controlled automatic irrigation systems and low-flow spray systems.

(iii) Apply heavy applications of mulch to landscaped areas to reduce evaporation.

(iv) Use treated wastewater for landscape irrigation where feasible.

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.8-5(a) and 4.8-6(a) will reduce the overall effect of the project on the shallow/intermediate and deep aquifers; however, these mitigation measures will not reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, this impact remains significant after mitigation. The Regents finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the project
outweigh this and the other unavoidable environmental impacts of the project for the reasons set forth in Section II.D of these findings.

9. Land Use and Planning

a. RMI Impact 5.4-15 Compatibility with Adjacent Land Uses. Implementation of the RMI would not result in the development of land uses that are substantially incompatible with existing adjacent land uses or planned uses. This is a less-than-significant impact.

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the potential for the RMI to result in the development of land uses that are incompatible with adjacent land uses is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.

10. Noise

a. RMI Impact 5.4-16 Noise Associated with Vehicular Traffic. Traffic to and from the RMI site would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. This is a less-than-significant impact

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the noise increase associated with traffic to and from the RMI site is a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.

b. RMI Impact 5.4-17 Rail Noise. The RMI Project would not expose noise-sensitive land uses to significant rail noise. This is a less-than-significant impact

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the RMI Project would have a less-than-significant impact associated with rail noise; therefore, no mitigation is required.

11. Population and Housing

FINDING: All RMI impacts associated with population and housing were adequately addressed in the Final EIR. No project-specific mitigation is required.

12. Public Services

FINDING: All RMI impacts associated with public services were adequately addressed in the Final EIR. No project-specific mitigation is required.

13. Recreation
FINDING: All RMI impacts associated with recreation were adequately addressed in the Final EIR. No project-specific mitigation is required.


a. RMI Impact 5.4-18 Intersection Operations. Implementation of the RMI would not cause unacceptable intersection operations. This is a less-than-significant impact.

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the effect of the RMI Project on intersection operations is a less-than-significant impact; therefore no mitigation is required.

b. RMI Impact 5.4-19 Additional Parking Demand. Implementation of the RMI would create additional parking demand on campus facilities. This is a less-than-significant impact.

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that the RMI Project will have a less-than-significant impact on parking demand; therefore no mitigation is required.

15. Utilities

a. RMI Impact 5.4-20 Demand on Campus Utilities. Implementation of the RMI would place a demand on campus utilities. This is a less-than-significant impact.

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

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

(ii) Continue the leak detection and repair program.

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

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

(v) Replace domestic water irrigation systems on the west and south campuses with an alternate water source (shallow/intermediate or reclaimed water), where feasible.
(vi) Install water meters at the proposed neighborhood to encourage residential water conservation.

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

**LRDP Mitigation 4.8-6(a)** The campus shall continue to implement water conservation strategies to reduce demand for water from the intermediate aquifer. Utility water conservation strategies shall include the following or equivalent measures:

(i) Landscape, where appropriate, with native, drought resistant plants and use lawns only where needed for pedestrian traffic, activity areas, and recreation.

(ii) Install efficient irrigation systems including centrally-controlled automatic irrigation systems and low-flow spray systems.

(iii) Apply heavy applications of mulch to landscaped areas to reduce evaporation.

(iv) Use treated wastewater for landscape irrigation where feasible.

**LRDP Mitigation 4.15-6(b)** The campus would continue to meet or exceed Title 24 energy conservation requirements for new buildings, and it would continue to incorporate energy efficient design elements outlined in the *UC Davis Campus Standards & Design Guide* in new construction and retrofit projects. These energy conservation standards may be subject to modification as more stringent standards are developed.

**FINDING:** For reasons stated in the Final EIR, The Regents finds that implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.8-5(a), 4.8-6(a), and 4.15-6(b) will further reduce the less-than-significant impact of RMI demand on campus utilities.

**C. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(d) require the lead agency approving a project to adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to ensure compliance during project implementation. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program adopted by the Board of Regents requires the University to monitor mitigation measures designed to reduce or eliminate significant impacts, as well as those mitigation measures designed to reduce environmental impacts which are less than significant. The Mitigation Monitoring Program includes all of the LRDP Mitigation Measures identified in the Final EIR that pertain to the RMI Academic Building as specified in these findings and has been designed to ensure compliance during implementation of the RMI Academic Building. The Board of Regents hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Program included in the UC Davis 2003 LRDP Final EIR.
The Board of Regents finds that the impacts of the RMI Academic Building have been mitigated to the extent feasible by the Mitigation Measures identified in the Final EIR and in the Mitigation Monitoring Program. The Board of Regents adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the RMI that accompanies the Final EIR. The Mitigation Monitoring Program designates responsibility and timing for the implementation of mitigation for conditions within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the University. Implementation of the Mitigation Measures specified in the Final EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring Program will be accomplished through administrative controls over Project planning and implementation, and monitoring and enforcement of these measures will be accomplished through verification in periodic Mitigation Monitoring Reports and periodic inspection by appropriate University personnel. The University reserves the right to make amendments and/or substitutions of Mitigation Measures if, in the exercise of discretion of the University, it is determined that the amended or substituted Mitigation Measure will mitigate the identified potential environmental impact to at least the same degree as the original Mitigation Measure, or would attain an adopted performance standard for mitigation, and where the amendment or substitution would not result in a new significant impact on the environment which cannot be mitigated.

D. ALTERNATIVES

The EIR evaluated a range of alternatives to the RMI Project in Section 5.5 of Volume III of the Final EIR. In compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the alternatives analysis also included an analysis of a No Project Alternative and discussed the environmentally superior alternative. The EIR examined the feasibility of each alternative, the environmentally superior alternative, the environmental impacts of each alternative, and the ability of each alternative to meet the project objectives as identified in Section 5.3.2 of Volume III of the Draft EIR. Table 5-2 in Volume III of the Draft EIR compares the environmental impacts of the proposed project and each of the alternatives. The Regents certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on alternatives provided in the Final EIR and the record of proceedings. The Regents finds that when compared to the alternatives analyzed in the Final EIR (including the No Project Alternative), the RMI Academic Building as proposed and mitigated provides a reasonable balance between maximizing satisfaction of the project objectives and minimizing significant environmental impacts. The Regents further finds that all the alternatives are infeasible, as that term is defined by CEQA, and are hereby rejected in favor of the RMI Academic Building as proposed, for the reasons set forth below.

1. Project Objectives

The Regents finds that the objectives for the RMI Project are as described in Section 3.3.2 of Volume III of the Draft EIR. The guiding objective for the RMI Project is to support instruction and research conducted by the V&E and FS&T departments in their academic programs in the study and research of the science of food and wine. The specific objectives of the RMI are as follows:
- Create a strong identity and an inviting entry for the Robert Mondavi Institute, the University of California Davis campus, and the departments of Viticulture and Enology, and Food Science and Technology
- Provide a state-of-the-art research and teaching facility, which provides education and extension programs for the industry, community, and campus, and continues the departments’ reputation for academic excellence
- Facilitate interaction between RMI researchers
- Accommodate visitors within the public portions of the project to encourage community outreach and education, while maintaining separation between research functions and public areas within the Institute
- Expand training capability for hands-on production of wine, in a facility similar to that which students will encounter in commercial experience
- Develop a flexible food processing facility to accommodate a variety of testing alternatives and simulations
- Demonstrate good environmental practices in all aspects of the project
- Accommodate future expansion of the Institute and the departments

2. Alternatives to the RMI

The University evaluated four alternatives to the RMI Project in the Final EIR: Smaller Project, Plant Science Teaching Center Lands, Dairy Road Recreation Field Location, and the No Project Alternative.

i. Smaller Project Alternative

Under the Smaller Project Alternative, the same site would be used as the proposed project, but the size of the RMI Project would be reduced by about 25 percent by eliminating the second phase of construction. As explained in the EIR, under this alternative, the RMI Academic Building (130,000 gsf) would be built as proposed but only the initial components of the associated Winery and Laboratory Buildings (43,000 gsf) would be built. Because this alternative would not reduce the size of the RMI Academic Building (which is the subject of these findings), this alternative is not applicable to RMI Academic Building.

ii. Plant Science Teaching Center Lands Alternative

This Alternative would develop the entire RMI Project on Plant Science Teaching Center Lands east of SR 113 and west of the Bowley Center on central campus. This site, which is now being used for growing crops, is currently proposed for future expansion of the Plant Sciences Teaching Center.
Under this alternative, the project impacts would generally be equivalent to the proposed project. However, the biological resource impacts would be more significant.

The Plant Science Teaching Center Lands Alternative meets the project’s objectives to provide a state-of-the-art research and teaching facility that provides education and extension programs for the industry, community, and campus as well as being proximity to other academic facilities and adjacent vacant land for future expansion. However, this alternative was rejected because impacts on biological resources would be more significant than the proposed project and because the location is less prominent than the proposed site and therefore may not lend itself to achieving the objective of creating a strong identity and an inviting entry for the RMI, the campus, and the V&E and FS&T departments.

iii. Dairy Road Recreation Field Location Alternative

This Alternative would develop the entire RMI Project on a 3-acre site currently occupied by the Dairy Road Recreation Field on the central campus, southeast of the Hutchison Drive/La Rue Road intersection. The parcel is designated for PE/ICA/Recreation land uses in the 2003 LRDP. This alternative would locate all the components of the proposed RMI on this site and would have the same population as the proposed project. The existing recreational use would be relocated elsewhere on campus.

This alternative would result in impacts that would be equal to or less significant than the project as proposed.

The Dairy Road Recreation Field Location Alternative would accomplish most of the objectives of the project. However, this alternative was rejected because the location of this site would not provide opportunities for the project to meet the objective of creating a strong identity and an inviting entry for the RMI, the associated departments, and the campus, as it would not be highly visible to passers-by outside the campus.

iv. No Project Alternative

In accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the Final EIR evaluates the “No Project Alternative,” which compares the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving it. The No Project Alternative describes the environmental conditions existing at the time of publication of the Notice of Preparation, along with a discussion of what would be reasonably expected to occur at the site in the foreseeable future, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.

Under the No Project Alternative, no RMI Project would be built. The existing uses on the proposed RMI site would continue.
Under this alternative, all impacts of the RMI Project as proposed would be eliminated.

Under the No Project Alternative, the goals of the RMI Project would not be achieved. The V&E and FS&T departments would continue to operate with outmoded facilities, and would not have the resources of a state-of-the-art research and teaching facility. Education and extension programs, and potential cooperative endeavors for the industry, community, and campus would be reduced. The departments would not be able to expand their training capacity for hands-on production of wine and modern food processing technology, to accommodate a variety of testing alternatives and simulations, or to offer experience in facilities similar to what students will encounter professionally. The campus would not create a strong identity and inviting entry to campus.

ix. Environmentally Superior Alternative

The Regents finds that other than the No Project Alternative, the environmentally superior alternative is the Dairy Road Recreation Field Alternative. It would eliminate the significant impact of the project on prime farmland. It would have reduced impacts relative to the proposed project with respect to biological and cultural resources, and to utilities. The Dairy Road Recreation Field Alternative would have a less-than-significant land use impact on recreation not shared by the project, through displacement of a recreation field.

E. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

i. Impacts That Remain Significant

As discussed above, The Regents has found that the following RMI Academic Building impacts remain significant following adoption and implementation of the mitigation measures described in the Final EIR. Mitigation of some of these impacts requires measures that are in the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency, and can and should be implemented by those agencies, as described in the Final EIR. If any of those mitigation measures are not implemented by the agencies who can and should implement them, the remaining impact may be significant and unavoidable.
Project Specific Impacts of the RMI Academic Building:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMI Impact 5.4-3</td>
<td>Conversion of prime farmland to nonagricultural use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMI Impact 5.4-4</td>
<td>Impact of air emissions from construction activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMI Impact 5.4-14</td>
<td>Impact on shallow/intermediate and deep aquifers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RMI Academic Building’s Contribution to Cumulative LRDP Impacts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LRDP Impact 4.1-5</td>
<td>Contribution to cumulative impact on visual character and quality of the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRDP Impact 4.1-6</td>
<td>Contribution to cumulative impact of new sources of light and glare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRDP Impact 4.2-3</td>
<td>Contribution to cumulative impact of loss of prime farmland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRDP Impact 4.3-6</td>
<td>Contribution to cumulative impact of regional emissions of non-attainment pollutants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRDP Impact 4.4-12</td>
<td>Contribution to cumulative loss of agricultural land and ruderal/annual grassland habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRDP Impact 4.4-14</td>
<td>Contribution to cumulative impact on valley elderberry longhorn beetle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRDP Impact 4.5-5</td>
<td>Contribution to cumulative impact on cultural resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRDP Impact 4.8-10</td>
<td>Contribution to cumulative water quality impact associated with increased urban runoff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRDP Impact 4.8-13</td>
<td>Contribution to cumulative impact on the regional deep aquifer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRDP Impact 4.8-14</td>
<td>Contribution to cumulative impact on the regional shallow/intermediate aquifer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRDP Impact 4.10-5</td>
<td>Contribution to cumulative impact on ambient noise levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRDP Impact 4.12-6</td>
<td>Contribution to cumulative impact associated with new police and fire facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRDP Impact 4.12-7</td>
<td>Contribution to cumulative impact associated with new school facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**ii. Overriding Considerations**

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, The Regents has, in determining whether or not to approve the RMI Academic Building, balanced the economic, social, technological and other benefits of the project against its unavoidable environmental risks, and has 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. The Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP are equally relevant to, and are adopted as part of, these findings. All cumulative significant and unavoidable impacts were previously addressed in the Findings and Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP and certification of the 2003 LRDP EIR.

A. The project implements a portion of the 2003 LRDP and is consistent with the analysis in the Final EIR.

B. The project would create a strong identity and an inviting entry for the Robert Mondavi Institute, the UC Davis campus, and the departments of Viticulture and Enology and Food Science Technology.

C. The project would provide a state-of-the-art research and teaching facility, which provides education and extension programs for the industry, community and campus, and continues the department’s reputation for academic excellence.

D. The project would facilitate interaction between RMI researchers.

E. The project would encourage community outreach and education.

F. The project would expand training capability for hands-on production of wine, in a facility similar to that which students will encounter in commercial experience.

G. The project would develop a flexible food processing facility to accommodate a variety of testing alternatives and simulations.
H. The project would accommodate future expansion of the Institute and the V&E and FS&T departments.

F. INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

These findings incorporate by reference in their entirety the text of the 2003 LRDP, the 2003 LRDP Final EIR, and the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 2003 LRDP. Without limitation, this incorporation is intended to elaborate on the scope and nature of the RMI Academic Building, potential environmental impacts that could result from the RMI Academic Building, related mitigation measures, and the basis for determining the significance of the impacts of the RMI Academic Building.

G. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Various documents and other materials constitute the record of proceedings upon which The Regents bases its findings and decisions contained herein. Most documents related to this project are located in the Office of Resource Management and Planning in Mrak Hall, Third Floor, University of California, One Shields Avenue, Davis, California 95616. The custodian for these records of proceedings is the Office of Resource Management and Planning.

H. SUMMARY

1. Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, The Regents has made one of more of the following Findings with respect to the significant environmental effects of the RMI Academic Building identified in the Final EIR:

   a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects on the environment.

   b. Those changes or alterations are wholly or partially within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other public agency.

   c. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the Final EIR that would otherwise avoid or substantially lessen the identified significant environmental effects of the project.

2. Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, it is hereby determined that:
a. All significant effects on the environment due to approval of the project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.

b. Any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the factors described Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section II.H., above.

III. APPROVALS

The Regents hereby takes the following actions:

A. The Regents hereby adopts and incorporates into the RMI Academic Building all mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the University set forth in Sections II.B and II.C of the Findings, above.

B. The Regents hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the RMI Academic Building and discussed in Section II.D of the Findings, above.

C. The Regents hereby adopts these findings in their entirety as its findings for these actions and approvals pertaining to the RMI Academic Building.

D. Having independently reviewed and analyzed the certified Final EIR, incorporated mitigation measures into the project, and adopted findings and a statement of overriding considerations, The Regents hereby approves the design of the Robert Mondavi Institute of Wine and Food Science, Davis campus.