

California Environmental Quality Act Findings of Fact Regarding the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Advanced Work Phase of the Central Utility Plant Modernization and Expansion Project State Clearinghouse No. 2023050563

I. CERTIFICATION

The Board of Regents of the University of California ("University") hereby certifies the Final Environmental Impact Report ("Final EIR" or "EIR") (State Clearinghouse No. 2023050563) for the UC Davis Sacramento Campus Central Utility Plant Expansion Project which consists of the Draft EIR, comment letters, responses to comments, corrections and revisions to the Draft EIR, and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan ("MMRP"). The proposed Central Utility Plant Expansion Project ("Central Utility Plant Expansion Project" or the "Project") contains various components. These findings discuss the following components relative to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Sections 21000, et seq. ("CEQA"), as specifically discussed and analyzed in the Final EIR:

- a) Advanced work components (otherwise known as make-ready projects) and;
- b) Land use amendment #3 to the 2020 LRDP Update to convert 3.17 acres of land designated for "Education, Research, and Housing" to "Support Space."

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines § 15090, the University, as Lead Agency for the Project, certified that:

- 1. The Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA;
- 2. The Final EIR was presented to the University, and the University has received, reviewed, and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and in the administrative record prior to approving the Project;
- 3. The Final EIR reflects the University's independent judgment and analysis.

The University further certifies that this Final EIR properly tiers from the UC Davis Sacramento Campus 2020 Long-Range Development Plan Update Supplemental EIR (2020 LRDP Update SEIR) pursuant to Public Resources Code §§ 21080.09 and 21094 and CEQA Guidelines §§15063(b)(1)(c) and 15152 and complies with all relevant requirements for tiered CEQA documents. The 2020 LRDP Update SEIR supplemented the 2010 LRDP EIR and analyzed the environmental impacts from long-range development on the UC Davis Sacramento campus through 2040.

The Project is within the growth projections analyzed in the 2020 LRDP Update SEIR and is consistent with the 2020 LRDP Update SEIR. The Final EIR incorporates by reference the information, analysis and conclusions contained in the 2020 LRDP Update SEIR, and considers all additional, relevant information that has become available since the University's certification of the 2020 LRDP Update SEIR; examines the project-specific impacts of the Project, including all impacts that (1) were not examined as significant effects on the environment in the 2020 LRDP Update SEIR or (2) are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance by the choice of specific revisions in the Project, by the imposition of feasible mitigation measures or Project conditions, or other means. The 2020 LRDP Update SEIR, from which this Final EIR is tiered, is available on the UC Davis

environmental planning website <https://environmentalplanning.ucdavis.edu/2020-lrdp-update-final-supplemental-eir>, as well as in hard copy at: UC Davis Health, Facilities Planning and Design, 4800 Second Avenue, Suite 3010, Sacramento, CA 95817 and UC Davis Office of Campus Planning and Environmental Stewardship, 436 Mark Hall, University of California, Davis, CA 95616.

The University has exercised independent judgment in accordance with Public Resources Code (“Public Resources Code” or “PRC”) § 21082.1(c) in retaining its own environmental consultant and directing the consultant in preparation of the EIR, as well as reviewing, analyzing, and revising material prepared by the consultant.

In accordance with Public Resources Code § 21081 and CEQA Guidelines § 15091, the University has made one or more specific written findings regarding significant impacts associated with the Project. Those findings are presented below, along with the rationale behind each of the findings. Concurrent with the adoption of these findings, the University adopts the MMRP and the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings on which the Project findings are based are located at UC Davis Office of Campus Planning and Environmental Stewardship, 436 Mark Hall, University of California, Davis, CA. 95616. The custodian for these documents is the UC Davis Office of Campus Planning and Environmental Stewardship, 436 Mark Hall, University of California, Davis, CA. 95616. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code § 21081.6(a)(2) and CEQA Guidelines § 15091(e).

II. **PROJECT BACKGROUND**

CENTRAL UTILITY PLANT EXPANSION

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

The Central Utility Plant Expansion Project is located within the 146-acre Sacramento Campus, approximately 2.5 miles southeast of downtown Sacramento, and 17 miles east of the UC Davis main campus in Davis. Land uses surrounding the campus include offices, public institutions, urban corridor, low-density suburban neighborhoods, and a high-density traditional neighborhood.

Components of the Central Utility Plant Expansion Project are included to describe the overall project. However, these Findings are applicable to the make-ready projects component, specifically.

- **Make-ready Projects to prepare for construction**—several make-ready projects would be required prior to initiation of the CUP Expansion Project. These include an extension of infrastructure to the site, transportation improvements, and site preparation and partial removal of the Facilities Support Services Building (FSSB), including foundation work for the future CUP Annex.
- **CUP Expansion Project Construction and Operation**—after make-ready work is complete, construction at the existing CUP and the expansion site would include remodeling the control room, including Americans with Disabilities Act improvements; routing new underground utilities for electricity and diesel fuel; and demolishing unused CUP yard walls to complete new roadway connections, pavement work, and landscaping. The CUP Annex would be constructed, new diesel tanks would be installed in the existing CUP yard, and new transformers and switchgear would be installed in the electrical yard. Finally, a new replacement well (see below

for details) and supporting structure would be installed and connected to the existing water infrastructure.

- **New SMUD Feeder for Normal Power**—UC Davis Health plans to eliminate dependence on gas and steam turbines for primary energy production and transition to electrical power from SMUD. To accomplish this, the existing normal-power service would need to be expanded. This project component would include construction of new infrastructure for a 116/21.9 kV, 40 MVA transformer and installation of a 40 MVA underground transmission line between SMUD’s East City Substation and the new electrical service yard at the CUP. This installation would also require new 21 kV, 1,200-ampere switchgear; new parallel conductors; new manholes; and a new circuit breaker at the CUP. This new service would be from SMUD’s East City Substation and delivered to campus from one of two potential routes, which were evaluated in the EIR.

B. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

UC Davis has identified the following objectives for the proposed Central Utility Plant Expansion Project.

- Increase the resiliency of utilities in the event of a utility outage to maintain care for the community in the Sacramento region.
- Comply with Health-Care Access and Information (HCAI) standards and requirements for health-care facilities.
- Provide the utility load needed for campus growth, including the California Hospital Tower and 48X Complex.
- Accommodate campus growth through 2035.
- Further campus compliance with the UC Sustainable Practices Policy, including initiation of development of a more efficient operating utility plant to reduce GHGs and set the Sacramento Campus on a path to carbon-free operations.
- Demolish outdated spaces to achieve seismic safety and remove buildings that cannot be operated efficiently or renovated.

C. PROCEDURAL COMPLIANCE WITH CEQA

The CEQA environmental review process for the Central Utility Plan Expansion Project started on May 23, 2023, with the UC Davis Sacramento campus’ issuance of a Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) of an EIR. The key milestones associated with preparation of an EIR are set forth and described below:

In accordance with PRC Section 21092 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, a NOP was prepared and circulated on May 23, 2023, for a minimum 30-day period of public and agency comment. The NOP was submitted to the State Clearinghouse and the Sacramento County clerk-recorder. A total of six letters were received during the scoping period. A copy of the NOP is included in Appendix A of the Final EIR.

The Public Draft EIR was issued on September 21, 2023. The Draft EIR was circulated until November 6, 2023, for a 45-day period of review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies, and organizations. A virtual public hearing (via zoom) was held on October 4, 2023, to receive input from agencies and the public on the Draft EIR. Copies of the Draft EIR were posted on the UC Davis Environmental Planning website for review. Hard copies of the document were made available at the UC Davis Health Center, the UC Davis Office of Environmental

Stewardship and Sustainability on the UC Davis campus, the Reserves at Shields Library, and the Colonial Heights Library.

Comment letters received on the Draft EIR and a transcript of oral testimony provided at the public hearing are provided in their entirety in Volume 3 of the Final EIR.

UC Davis received six comment letters, including two from state agencies, two from local or regional agencies, one organization and one from an individual. In addition, one member of the public spoke at the virtual public hearing and provided a total of seven comments on the Draft EIR.

The Final EIR was completed and published on December 27, 2023.

Included in the Final EIR are Volume 1, the Final EIR, and Volume 2, the appendices, and Volume 3, Comments, Responses, MMRP, and Revisions to the Draft EIR. Volume 3 contains an Introduction (Chapter 1) that describes minor changes to the Draft EIR since public release of the Draft EIR on September 21, 2023, comment letters and responses to comments (Chapter 2), the MMRP (Chapter 3), and corrections and revisions to the Draft EIR (Chapter 4).

D. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND FINDINGS

Pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21081 and CEQA Guidelines §15091, no public agency shall approve or carry out a Project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the Project is approved or carried out unless the public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each significant impact:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
2. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the EIR.

The University has made one or more of these specific written findings regarding each significant impact associated with the Project. Those findings are presented below, along with a presentation of facts in support of the findings.

These findings summarize the determinations of the Final EIR with respect to the Project's impacts before and after mitigation and do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact considered in the Final EIR. Instead, the findings provide a summary description of each impact, describe the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and adopted by the University for the Project, and state the University's findings regarding the significance of each impact with the adopted mitigation measures. The Final EIR contains a full explanation of each impact, mitigation measure, and the analysis that led the University to its conclusions on those impacts. These findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the Final EIR, which supports the Final EIR's determinations regarding the Project's environmental impacts and mitigation measures. In making these findings, the University ratifies, adopts, and incorporates by reference the Final EIR's analysis, determinations, and conclusions relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent that any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

In adopting the mitigation measures described below, the University intends to adopt each of the mitigation measures recommended in the Final EIR related to the Project. Accordingly, in the event that a mitigation measure recommended in the Final EIR has been inadvertently omitted from these findings, that mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated by reference in the findings. Additionally, in the event that the description of mitigation measures set forth below fails accurately to capture the substance of a given mitigation measure due to a clerical error (as distinct from specific and express modification by the University through these Findings), the language of the mitigation measure as set forth in the Final EIR shall govern.

The Final EIR evaluation included a detailed analysis of impacts in 16 environmental disciplines, analyzing the Project and alternatives, including a No Project Alternative. The EIR discloses the environmental impacts expected to result from the construction and operation of the Project. Where feasible, mitigation measures were identified to avoid or minimize significant environmental effects. In addition, the campus committed to implementing measures in order to reduce the direct and indirect impacts that would result from Project activities. The mitigation measures identified in the EIR are measures proposed by the lead agency, responsible or trustee agencies or other persons that were not included in the Project but could reasonably be expected to reduce adverse impacts if required as conditions of approving the Project, as required by CEQA Guidelines § 15126.4(a)(1)(A).

1. Findings on Less than Significant Impacts

Based on the issue area assessment in the Final EIR, the University has determined that the make-ready component of the Project will have no impact or less than significant impacts for several issues as summarized in the table below. The rationale for the conclusion that no significant impact would occur in each of the issue areas in the table is based on the discussion of these impacts in the detailed issue area analyses in Volume 1, Sections 3.1 through 3.16 of the Final EIR that were found to have no impact or less than significant impacts.

Table 1. Summary of No Impacts and Less Than Significant Impacts

Environmental Impacts
<i>Aesthetics</i>
AES-1: The Project would not conflict with zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality in urbanized areas
<i>Air Quality</i>
AQ-1: The Project would not conflict with or obstruction of implementation of the applicable air quality plan
AQ-4: The Project would not cause odor effects nor expose receptors to adverse odors
<i>Biological Resources</i>
BIO-1: The Project would not result in adverse impacts on valley elderberry longhorn beetle
BIO-5: The Project would not conflict with a local policy or ordinance protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.
<i>Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resources</i>
CUL-1: The Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource
TCR-1: The Project would not have potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource with cultural value to a California Native American tribe and that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)

Environmental Impacts

TCR-2: The Project would not have potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource with cultural value to a California Native American tribe and that is a resource determined by the lead agency to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1

Energy

EN-1: The Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during Project construction or operation

EN-2: The Project would not conflict with or obstruction of a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency

Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

GEO-3: The Project would not place Project facilities on expansive soil, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GHG-1: The Project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment

GHG-2: The Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

HAZ-1: The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials

HAZ-2: The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment

HAZ-3: The Project would not result in hazardous emissions or handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school

HAZ-4: The Project would not result in placement of project-related facilities on a site that is on a list of hazardous materials sites, resulting in the creation of a significant hazard to the public or environment.

HAZ-5: The Project would not impair implementation of or physical interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan

Hydrology and Water Quality

WQ-1: The Project would not result in a violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or other degradation of surface or groundwater quality

WQ-2: The Project would not result in a substantial decrease of groundwater supplies or substantial interference with groundwater recharge such that the Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin

WQ-4: The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan

Land Use and Planning

LU-1: The Project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect

Noise

NOI-2: The Project would not generate increased ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity in excess of applicable noise standards during Project operations

NOI-3: Construction of the Project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels

Environmental Impacts

NOI-4: The Project would not place Project-related activities in the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, resulting in exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels

Population and Housing

POP-1: The Project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth either directly or indirectly

Public Services

PS-1: The Project would not create a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection facilities

PS-2: The Project would not create a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection facilities

PS-3: The Project would not create a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for school facilities

PS-4: The Project would not create a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for other public facilities

Recreation

REC-1: The Project would not substantially increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated

Transportation, Circulation, and Parking

TRA-1: The Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities

TRA-2: The Project would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)

TRA-3: The Project would not result in changes to the transportation system that would create hazardous features or incompatible traffic uses

TRA-4: The Project would not result in inadequate emergency access

Utilities and Service Systems

UT-1: The Project would not result in relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, with the potential to cause significant environmental effects

UT-2: The Project would not create a need for new or expanded entitlements or resources for sufficient water supply to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years

UT-3: The Project would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments

UT-4: The Project would not result in Project-related exceedance of state or local solid waste standards or of the capacity of local infrastructure, or other impediments to attaining solid waste reduction goals

UT-5: The Project would not result in inconsistency with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste

2. Findings on Significant Environmental Impacts That Can be Reduced to a Less Than Significant Level

The University finds that the following environmental impacts can and will be mitigated to below a level of significance based upon the implementation of the mitigation measures in the EIR. These findings are based on the discussion of impacts in the detailed issue area analyses in Volume 1, Sections 3.1 through 3.16 of the Final EIR. An explanation of the rationale for each finding is presented below.

a) Aesthetics

Impact AES-2: *The Project could result in the introduction of a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area. (See Final EIR Section 3.1.2)*

FINDING: The University finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which mitigate significant effects on the environment from Impact AES-2. Specifically, Mitigation Measures LRDP-AES-2a, LRDP-AES-2b, LRDP-AES-2c, and LRDP-AES-2d are feasible and are adopted to mitigate significant effects from Impact AES-2 to a less than significant level (Volume 1, Section 3.1.2, pages 3.1-13 through 3.1-15).

Mitigation Measure LRDP-AES-2a: Apply Design Measures to Building Exteriors

Design for specific projects shall provide for the use of textured non-reflective exterior surfaces and non-reflective glass.

Mitigation Measure LRDP-AES-2b: Utilize Directional Lighting Methods

Except as provided in LRDP Mitigation Measure AES-4c, all new outdoor lighting will utilize directional lighting methods with shielded and cutoff light fixtures to minimize glare and upward-directed lighting.

Mitigation Measure LRDP-AES-2c: Review Lighting, Landscape, and Architectural Features Prior to Installation

Non-cutoff, unshielded lighting fixtures used to enhance nighttime views of walking paths, specific landscape features, or specific architectural features will be reviewed by the Sacramento Campus Facilities Design and Construction staff prior to installation to ensure that the minimum amount of required lighting is proposed to achieve the desired nighttime emphasis, and the proposed illumination creates no adverse effect on nighttime views.

Mitigation Measure LRDP-AES-2d: Implement Updated Lighting Design

The University will implement the use of the specific lighting design and equipment designed to reduce light spill and glare when older lighting fixtures and designs are replaced over time.

Rationale for Finding: Mitigation Measures LRDP-AES-2a through LRDP-AES-2d would apply design measures to building exteriors, utilize directional lighting methods, require review of lighting, landscape, and architectural features prior to installation, and implement updated lighting design.

b) Air Quality

Impact AQ-2: *The Project could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. (See Final EIR Section 3.2.2)*

FINDING: The University finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which mitigate significant effects on the environment from Impact AQ-2 due to NO_x emissions during construction activities and NO_x emissions resulting from operation of the Project. Specifically, Mitigation Measures LRDP-AQ-2a, LRDP-AQ-2b, LRDP-AQ-2c, LRDP-AQ-2d, and AQ-2 are feasible and are adopted to mitigate significant effects from Impact AQ-2 to a less than significant level for construction activities and operational activities (Final EIR pages 3.2-16 through 3.2-23).

Mitigation Measure LRDP-AQ-2a: Reduce construction-generated fugitive dust

Land use development projects as part of the implementation of the 2020 LRDP Update will require all construction contractors to implement the following measures to reduce construction-generated fugitive dust. Control of fugitive dust is required per SMAQMD Rule 403 and enforced by SMAQMD staff. The list of required measures was informed by SMAQMD's basic and enhanced construction emission control practices.

- Water exposed soil with adequate frequency to prevent fugitive dust and particulates from leaving the project site. However, do not overwater to the extent that sediment flows off the site. Exposed surfaces include, but are not limited to, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved parking areas.
- Suspend excavation, grading, and/or demolition activity when sustained wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour (mph).
- Install wind breaks (e.g., trees, solid fencing) on the average dominant windward side(s) of construction areas. For purposes of implementation, chain-link fencing with added landscape mesh fabric adequately qualifies as solid fencing.
- For dust control in disturbed but inactive construction areas, apply soil stabilization measures adequate to mitigate airborne particulates as soon as possible.
- Use wet power vacuum street sweepers to remove any visible trackout mud or dirt onto adjacent public roads at least once a day. Use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.
- Treat site accesses from the paved road with a 6- to 12-inch layer of wood chips, mulch, gravel, or other approved method to reduce generation of road dust and road dust carryout onto public roads.
- Cover or maintain at least 2 feet of free board space on haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material on the site. Any haul trucks that would be traveling along freeways or major roadways should be covered.
- Establish a 15 mph speed limit for vehicles driving on unpaved portions of project construction sites.
- Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person will respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The phone number of the SMAQMD will also be visible to ensure compliance.

UC Davis will ensure that the implementation of this mitigation measure is consistent with the UC Davis stormwater program and does not result in offsite runoff as a result of watering for dust control purposes.

Mitigation Measure LRDP-AQ-2b: Reduce construction-generated emissions from equipment and vehicle exhaust

Land use development projects as part of the implementation of the 2020 LRDP Update will require all construction contractors to implement the following measures to reduce construction-generated emissions from equipment and vehicle exhaust. The list of required measures was informed by SMAQMD's basic and enhanced construction emission control practices.

- For all development except Aggie Square Phase I, use construction equipment with engines meeting EPA Tier 3 or better emission standards prior to 2025 and EPA Tier 4 Final or better emission standards beginning in 2025. For Aggie Square Phase I, all engines must be EPA certified Tier 4 Final or better, regardless of construction year. Equipment requirements may be waived by UC Davis but only under the following unusual circumstances: if use of a particular piece of off-road equipment meeting Tier 4 Final standards or Tier 3 standards is not technically feasible, or the equipment is not commercially available, or there is a compelling emergency requiring the use of off-road equipment that does not meet the equipment requirements above. If UC Davis grants the waiver, the contractor will use the next-cleanest piece of off-road equipment available in the following order: Tier 4 Interim, Tier 3, and then Tier 2 engines.
- Use renewable diesel fuel in all heavy-duty, off-road diesel-fueled equipment. Renewable diesel must meet the most recent ASTM D975 specification for ultra low-sulfur diesel and have a carbon intensity no greater than 50 percent of the diesel with the lowest carbon intensity among petroleum diesel fuels sold in California.
- Use a model year 2010 or newer engine in all diesel on-road trucks used to haul construction materials.
- Minimize idling time either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the time of idling to 5 minutes (California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 13, Sections 2449[d][3] and 2485). Provide clear signage that posts this requirement for workers at the entrances to the site.
- Provide current certificate(s) of compliance with CARB's In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets Regulation (CCR, Title 13, Sections 2449 and 2449.1).
- Maintain all construction equipment in proper working condition, according to manufacturer's specifications. The equipment must be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition before it is operated.

Mitigation Measure LRDP-AQ-2d: Offset construction-generated NO_x emissions in excess of SMAQMD's threshold of significance

Construction-generated emissions of NO_x would exceed the SMAQMD's threshold of significance during 2020, 2022, and 2024. Therefore, UC Davis will pay a mitigation fee in the amount of \$4,558 and an administrative fee in the amount of \$228 to SMAQMD to reduce the project impacts from construction NO_x emissions to a less-than-significant level. This fee will be used to fund emissions reduction projects within the SVAB. The types of projects that have been used in

the past to achieve such reductions include electrification of stationary internal-combustion engines (such as agricultural irrigations pumps); replacement of old trucks with newer, cleaner, more efficient trucks; and a host of other stationary- and mobile-source emissions-reducing projects. The fee is based on an offset cost of \$30,000 per ton of NO_x and the total quantity of NO_x emissions in excess of SMAQMD's NO_x threshold (304 pounds, or 0.15 ton, based on the daily exceedances in 2020, 2022, and 2024). The administrative fee is 5 percent of the fee.

UC Davis will pay the mitigation and administrative fees in full prior to issuing a demolition or grading permit for the first project developed under the 2020 LRDP Update. For construction projects under the 2020 LRDP Update occurring during 2020, 2022, and 2024, construction contractors will provide annual construction activity monitoring data to estimate actual construction emissions. UC Davis will submit the annual construction activity monitoring data and an estimate of actual annual NO_x emissions to SMAQMD for review by February 1 of each year for the prior construction year. The annual report will reconcile paid fees for the prior year relative to actual emissions. If more emissions were generated than covered by the fees paid, UC Davis will submit payment for the deficient amount, based on an offset cost of \$30,000 per ton of NO_x. If more fees were paid than needed for the emissions generated, SMAQMD will either issue UC Davis a refund for the surplus or a credit that can be applied to future fee payments.

An alternative payment plan may be negotiated by UC Davis, based on the timing of construction phases that are expected to exceed the SMAQMD's threshold of significance. Any alternative payment plan must be acceptable to SMAQMD and agreed upon in writing prior to issuance of a demolition or grading permit by UC Davis.

In coordination with SMAQMD, UC Davis, or its designee, may reanalyze construction NO_x emissions from the 2020 LRDP Update prior to starting construction to update the required mitigation and administrative fees. The analysis must be conducted using the SMAQMD-approved emissions model(s) and the fee rates published at the time of reanalysis. The analysis may include onsite measures to reduce construction emissions if deemed feasible by UC Davis. All onsite measures assumed in the analysis must be included in the construction contracts and be enforceable by UC Davis.

Rationale for Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure LRDP-AQ-2a includes measures to reduce construction-generated fugitive dust. Mitigation Measure LRDP-AQ-2b would reduce construction-generated emissions from equipment and vehicle exhaust. Mitigation Measure LRDP-AQ-2d would offset construction-generated NO_x emissions in excess of SMAQMD's threshold of significance. These measures would reduce construction related impacts below SMAQMD's thresholds. ***Impact AQ-3:*** *The Project could result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (See Final EIR Section 3.2.2)*

FINDING: The University finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which mitigate significant effects on the environment from Impact AQ-3 due to exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations during construction activities and NO_x emissions resulting from operation of the Project. Specifically, Mitigation Measures LRDP-AQ-2a, LRDP-AQ-2b, LRDP-AQ-2c, LRDP-AQ-2d, and LRDP-AQ-3b are feasible and are adopted to mitigate significant effects from Impact AQ-3 to a less than significant level for construction activities and operational activities (Final EIR pages 3.2-23 through 3.2-30).

Mitigation Measure LRDP-AQ-2a: Reduce construction-generated fugitive dust

Refer to measure description under Impact AQ-2.

Mitigation Measure LRDP-AQ-2b: Reduce construction-generated emissions from equipment and vehicle exhaust

Refer to measure description under Impact AQ-2.

Mitigation Measure LRDP-AQ-2d: Offset construction-generated NOX emissions in excess of SMAQMD's threshold of significance

Refer to measure description under Impact AQ-2.

c) Biological Resources

Impact BIO-2: The Project could disturb vegetation-nesting migratory birds and raptors, including Swainson's hawk and white-tailed kite. (See Final EIR Section 3.3.2)

FINDING: The University finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which mitigate significant effects on the environment from Impact BIO-2. Specifically, Mitigation Measure LRDP-BIO-2 is feasible and is adopted to mitigate significant effects from Impact BIO-2 to a less than significant level (Final EIR Volume 1, Section 3.3, pages 3.3-6 through 3.3-8).

Mitigation Measure LRDP-BIO-2: Conduct preconstruction surveys for nesting migratory birds and raptors, including special-status species, and establish protective buffers

For any projects implemented under the 2020 LRDP Update that would require vegetation removal (i.e., trees, shrubs, and ruderal vegetation) or would result in construction disturbances in the vicinity of vegetated areas, the following measures will be implemented prior to initiation of construction to avoid and minimize impacts to Swainson's hawk, white-tailed kite, and other vegetation-nesting migratory birds and raptors, and to avoid violation of the MBTA, CESA, and California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3511.

- For construction activities that occur during the nesting season for migratory birds and raptors, between February 15 and August 31, the University will ensure that a qualified wildlife biologist familiar with the nesting behavior of bird species that occur in the plan area to conduct a preconstruction nesting bird survey. The nesting bird surveys will be conducted no more than 14 days prior to vegetation removal or construction disturbance activities near nesting habitat. The survey will include a search of all trees and shrubs, and ruderal areas that provide suitable nesting habitat for birds and raptors within the construction disturbance area. In addition, a 600-foot area around the construction area will be surveyed for nesting raptors and a 100-foot area around the construction area will be surveyed for songbirds.
- If no special-status raptor species (i.e., Swainson's hawk or white-tailed kite) or active bird or raptor nests are detected during the preconstruction surveys, then no additional measures are required. If an active nest is found in the survey area, a no-disturbance buffer will be established to avoid disturbance or destruction of the nest site until the end of the breeding season (generally August 31) or until after a qualified wildlife biologist determines that the young have fledged and moved out of the construction area (this date varies by species). The extent of these buffers will be determined by a qualified biologist in coordination with any applicable agencies (as determined by species), and will depend on the level of noise or construction disturbance taking place, the line-of-sight between the nest and the disturbance, ambient levels of noise and other non-project disturbances, and other topographical or artificial barriers. Suitable buffer distances may vary between species;

however, a minimum of 50 feet for songbirds and 300 feet for raptors is typical. In developed habitats, buffer areas may be adjusted based on presence of existing barriers.

Rationale for Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure LRDP-BIO-2 would require a preconstruction nesting bird survey, and if an active nest is found, a no disturbance buffer will be established until the end of the breeding season (generally August 31).

Impact BIO-3: *The Project could disturb structure-nesting migratory birds, including purple martin. (See Final EIR Section 3.3.2)*

FINDING: The University finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which mitigate significant effects on the environment from Impact BIO-3. Specifically, Mitigation Measure LRDP-BIO-3 is feasible and is adopted to mitigate significant effects from Impact BIO-3 to a less than significant level (Final EIR Volume 1, Section 3.3, pages 3.3-8 through 3.3-10).

Mitigation Measure LRDP-BIO-3: Modify existing structures during the non-breeding season for purple martin and other structure-nesting migratory birds or implement exclusion measures to deter nesting

For any projects implemented under the 2020 LRDP Update that would modify or demolish any existing building structures, the following measures will be implemented prior to initiation of construction to avoid and minimize impacts on purple martins and other structure-nesting migratory birds, and to avoid violation of the MBTA and California Fish and Game Code Section 3503.

- Conduct building demolition and modification activities during the non-breeding season for structure-nesting migratory birds (generally September 1 through January 31). If this is not possible, the University will implement the following avoidance measures.
- Prior to the start of each phase of demolition/construction that is anticipated to occur during the migratory bird breeding season (generally February through August), the University will retain a qualified wildlife biologist to thoroughly inspect structures that would be modified or disturbed to locate remnant bird nests or areas such as drain holes or crevices that could be used as nesting areas by migratory birds such as purple martins. It is preferable to perform this survey in the non-breeding season (September 1 through January 31) so that if nests are found and are determined to be inactive, they may be removed.
- After inactive nests are removed and prior to construction that would occur between February 1 and August 31, known or potential nesting areas on or within the building structure to be modified or demolished will be covered with a suitable exclusion material that will prevent birds from nesting (i.e., 0.5- to 0.75-inch mesh netting, plastic tarp, or other suitable material safe for wildlife). Portions of the existing structures containing drain holes or crevices that would be modified or disturbed also will be covered or filled with suitable material to prevent nesting (i.e., fiberglass insulation, foam padding, and polyvinyl chloride [PVC]/acrylonitrile butadiene styrene [ABS] caps). The University will ensure that a qualified wildlife management specialist experienced with installation of bird exclusion materials will ensure that exclusion devices are properly installed and will avoid inadvertent entrapment of migratory birds. All exclusion devices will be installed before February 1 and will be monitored throughout

the breeding season (typically several times a week). The exclusion material will be anchored so that birds cannot attach their nests to the structures through gaps in a net.

- Exclusion devices for migratory birds will be installed consistent with bat exclusion measures and in a manner that does not entrap day-roosting bats.
- If exclusion material is not installed on structures prior to February 1 and migratory birds colonize a structure, removal or modification to that portion of the structure may not occur until after August 31, or until a qualified biologist has determined that the young have fledged and the nest is no longer in use.
- If surveys determine that no active bird nests are present within existing structures to be modified or demolished and appropriate steps are taken to prevent migratory birds from constructing new nests as described in the preceding measures, work can proceed at any time of the year.

Rationale for Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure LRDP-BIO-3 would modify existing structures during the non-breeding season for purple martin and other structure-nesting migratory birds or implement exclusion measures to deter nesting.

Impact BIO-4: *The Project could disturb structure-roosting bats. (See Final EIR Section 3.3.2)*

FINDING: The University finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which mitigate significant effects on the environment from Impact BIO-4. Specifically, Mitigation Measure LRDP-BIO-4 is feasible and is adopted to mitigate significant effects from Impact BIO-4 to a less than significant level (Final EIR Volume 1, Section 3.3, pages 3.3-10 through 3.3-12).

Mitigation Measure LRDP-BIO-4: Conduct pre-construction surveys for roosting bats and implement protection measures

Baseline data about how bats may use structures in the plan area, their individual numbers, or how they vary seasonally are not available. Daily and seasonal variations in habitat use by bats is common. To obtain the highest likelihood of detection, the following pre-construction bat surveys will be conducted within the construction area prior to modification or demolition of existing building structures. If surveys determine that bats are roosting in the construction area, the University will implement the following protective measures.

Conduct Pre-Construction Surveys at Structures

- Before work begins on any building or structure, qualified biologists will conduct a daytime search for bat signs and evening emergence surveys to determine whether the structure is being used as a roost. Biologists conducting daytime surveys will listen for audible bat calls and will use the naked eye, binoculars, and a high-powered spotlight to inspect crevices, drain holes, and other visible features that could house bats. Building surfaces and the ground around the structure will be surveyed for bat signs, such as guano, staining, and prey remains. Surveys will occur no earlier than two weeks prior to the construction start-date.
- Qualified biologists also will conduct evening emergence surveys at structures that contain suitable roosting areas. The surveys will consist of at least one biologist stationed near potential entry and exit points of the structure watching for emerging bats from a half hour before sunset to 1–2 hours after sunset for a minimum of 2 nights at each survey location within the season that construction would be taking place. Surveys may take place over

several nights to fully cover the extent of structure work. All emergence surveys will be conducted during favorable weather conditions (calm nights with temperatures conducive to bat activity and no precipitation predicted). Survey methodology may be supplemented as new research identifies advanced survey techniques and equipment that would aid in bat detections. Acoustic detectors will be used during emergence surveys to obtain data on bat species present in the survey area at the time of detection.

- If a building or structure proposed for modification or demolition is identified as supporting an active bat roost, additional surveys may be required to determine how the structure is used by bats—whether it is used as a night roost, maternity roost, migration stopover, or for hibernation.

Identify Protective Measures for Bats Using Structures

- If it is determined that bats are using building structures within or adjacent to the construction area as roost sites, the University will coordinate with CDFW to identify protective measures to avoid and minimize impacts on roosting bats based on the type of roost and timing of activities. These measures could include the following actions.
 - If a non-maternity roost is located within a structure that would be modified or disturbed in a manner that would expose the roost, bats will be excluded from the structure by a qualified wildlife management specialist working with a bat biologist. An exclusion plan will be developed in coordination with CDFW that identifies the type of exclusion material/devices to be used, the location and method for installing the devices, and monitoring schedule for checking the effectiveness of the devices. Exclusion devices will be installed between September 15 and October 31 to avoid affecting maternal and hibernating bat roosts and will take place during weather and temperature conditions conducive to bat activity. Because bats are expected to tolerate temporary construction noise and vibrations, bats will not be excluded from structures if no direct impacts on the roost are anticipated.
 - An alternative to installing exclusion devices would be to make structural changes to a known roost proposed for removal to create conditions in the roost that are undesirable to roosting bats and encourage the bats to leave on their own (e.g., open additional portals so that the temperature, wind, light, and precipitation regime in the roost change). Structural changes to the roost will be authorized by CDFW and will be performed during the appropriate exclusion timing (listed above) to avoid harming bats.
 - If a maternity roost is located, whether solitary or colonial, that roost will remain undisturbed until September 15 or until a qualified biologist has determined that the roost is no longer active.

Rationale for Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure LRDP-BIO-4 would require pre-construction surveys for roosting bats and implement protection measures.

d) Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resources

Impact CUL-2: *Potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. (See Final EIR Section 3.4.2)*

FINDING: The University finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which mitigate significant effects on the environment from Impact CUL-2. No archaeological resources have been identified within the Project area. However, there is potential that buried archaeological resources could be encountered during construction.

Mitigation Measures LRDP-CUL-2a and LRDP-CUL-2b are feasible and are adopted to mitigate significant effects from Impact CUL-2 to a less than significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measures LRDP-CUL-2a and LRDP-CUL-2b would ensure that impacts on unknown archaeological resources are avoided. (Final EIR Volume 1, Section 3.4, pages 3.4-8 and 3.4-9).

Mitigation Measure LRDP-CUL-2a: Conduct cultural resources sensitivity training

Prior to any ground disturbance, construction crews will be required to attend a cultural resources sensitivity training. The training will focus on identifying potential archaeological resources, as well as human remains. If potential archaeological resources or human remains are encountered, construction crews will be instructed to notify the UC immediately.

Mitigation Measure LRDP-CUL-2b: Stop work in the event of discovery of an archaeological resource

If an archaeological resource is discovered during construction, all project-related ground disturbance within 100 feet of the find will cease. The UC will contact a qualified archaeologist within 24 hours to inspect the site. If a resource is determined to qualify as a unique archaeological resource (as defined by CEQA), and the UC determines, in compliance with PRC 21083.2, which requires preservation in place as a first option, that the resource cannot feasibly be avoided, the UC will retain a qualified archaeologist to conduct excavations to recover the material. Any archaeologically important artifacts recovered during monitoring will be cleaned, catalogued, and analyzed, with the results presented in an archaeological data recovery report.

Rationale for Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measures LRDP-CUL-2a and LRDP-CUL-2b would entail conducting cultural resources sensitivity training and require that work will be stopped in the event of discovery of an archaeological resource.

Impact CUL-3: *Development of the Project could cause disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries. (See Final EIR Section 3.4.2)*

FINDING: The University finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which mitigate significant effects on the environment from Impact CUL-3. There is a high potential to encounter historic-era human remains, especially in the northern portion of the Sacramento Campus, where an unmarked cemetery associated with the Sacramento County Hospital was discovered in 2005. Damage or destruction of human remains would be a significant impact. Mitigation Measure LRDP-CUL-3b is feasible and is adopted. Implementation of Mitigation Measure LRDP-CUL-3b would ensure that impacts on unknown human remains are less than significant. (Final EIR Volume 1, Section 3.4, pages 3.4-10 and 3.4-11).

Mitigation Measure LRDP-CUL-3b: Stop work if human remains are encountered

In the event of a discovery on campus of human bone, suspected human bone, or a burial, all excavation within 100 feet of the find will halt immediately and the UC will contact a qualified archaeologist or the County Coroner within 24 hours to determine whether the bone is human. 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 5097.5 procedures, the UC will ensure that the remains, and a reasonable buffer around the remains established in coordination with the coroner or archaeologist, are protected against further disturbance. If it is determined that the find is of Native American

origin, the UC 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 will 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 will provide results of all such studies to the local Native American community and will provide an opportunity of local Native American involvement in any interpretative reporting.

If the human remains are determined to be historic, and cannot be avoided and preserved in place, the project site will be excavated under the supervision of an archaeologist and all human remains and associated artifacts will be removed from the site and analyzed. After analysis, all recovered human remains and associated artifacts will be placed in caskets and buried in a single mass grave at a local cemetery.

Rationale for Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure LRDP-CUL-3b would include stopping work in the event of discovery of human remains. If determined to be human remains then the remains would be either preserved in place or a qualified archaeologist and the MLD are provided an opportunity to confer on archaeological treatment of human remains and that appropriate studies, as identified through this consultation, are carried out prior to reinterment.

e) Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

Impact GEO-1: *Development of the Project could cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving liquefaction. (See Final EIR Section 3.6.2)*

FINDING: The University finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which mitigate significant effects on the environment from Impact GEO-1. A geotechnical investigation would be necessary to eliminate risks related to liquefaction. Mitigation Measure LRDP-GEO-1 is feasible and adopted to mitigate the significant effects of Impact GEO-1 to a less than significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure LRDP-GEO-1 would reduce the impact of risks related to liquefaction. (Final EIR Volume 1, Section 3.6, pages 3.6-3 and 3.6-4).

Mitigation Measure LRDP-GEO-1: Conduct Geotechnical Investigation

A site-specific, design-level geotechnical investigation will be conducted during the design phase of each building project under the 2020 LRDP Update. This investigation will 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 will subsequently be incorporated into the foundation and building design for the building project.

Rationale for Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure LRDP-GEO-1 would require a geotechnical investigation and would provide recommendations regarding building foundations and design.

Impact GEO-2: *Development of the Project could result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. (See Final EIR Section 3.6.2)*

FINDING: The University finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which mitigate significant effects on the environment from Impact GEO-2. The Project would be subject to a SWPPP, NPDES permit compliance, geotechnical investigation, and

adherence to any resulting geotechnical investigation recommendations. Mitigation Measure LRDP-GEO-1 is feasible and adopted to mitigate the significant effects of Impact GEO-2 to a less than significant level and would reduce impacts related to soil erosion (Final EIR Volume 1, Section 3.6, pages 3.6-4 and 3.6-5).

Mitigation Measure LRDP-GEO-1: Conduct Geotechnical Investigation

See above under Impact GEO-1 for full text.

Rationale for Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure LRDP-GEO-1 would reduce impacts to soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

f) Hydrology and Water Quality

Impact WQ-3: *The Project could result in a substantial alteration of existing drainage patterns in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite, substantial increase in the amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite, creation of or contribution to runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, or alteration of the existing drainage pattern in a manner that would impede or redirect flood flows. (See Final EIR Section 3.8.2)*

FINDING: The University finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which mitigate significant effects on the environment from Impact WQ-3. Specifically, Mitigation Measure LRDP-WQ-1 is feasible and is adopted to mitigate significant effects from Impact WQ-3 to a less than significant level (Final EIR Volume 1, Section 3.8 pages 3.9-11 and 3.9-12).

Mitigation Measure LRDP-WQ-1: Implement a Subsoil Drainage System to Avoid Damage to Buildings

In the event a subsoil drainage system is required (as determined by a geotechnical analysis), the system will be installed underground to remove excessive water from the soil, and avoid damage to buildings or landscaping. Groundwater from exterior building footings will be conveyed to a sump pump. The effluent will be pumped into the building storm drainage system. Subsoil drainage systems that cannot discharge to the storm sewer by gravity flow will be drained by gravity to sump pumps and will be pumped into the building storm drainage system. Each sump pump will be sized for 100 percent of the estimated design flow. Sump pumps will be connected to the emergency (standby) power system to permit operation during a loss of normal power. Design criteria for the subsoil drainage system will be defined by the geotechnical report.

Rationale for Finding: With implementation of Mitigation Measure LRDP-WQ-1, risks related to stormwater drainage patterns temporarily altered during construction would be reduced to a less than significant level.

g) Transportation, Circulation, and Parking

Impact TRA-5: *The Project could result in construction activity that could cause temporary impacts on transportation and traffic. (See Final EIR Section 3.15.2)*

FINDING: The University finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which mitigate significant effects on the environment from Impact TRA-5. Specifically,

Mitigation Measure LRDP-TRA-5 is feasible and is adopted to mitigate significant effects from Impact TRA-5 to a less than significant level (Final EIR Volume 1, Section 3.15, pages 3.15-13 through 3.15-15).

Mitigation Measure LRDP-TRA-5: Prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will be prepared to the satisfaction of UC Davis Health and the City of Sacramento Department of Public Works for City-owned roadways

The Construction TMP will include items such as the following.

- Preserving emergency vehicle access routes to existing buildings on the Sacramento Campus.
- Providing truck circulation routes/patterns that minimizes effects on existing vehicle traffic during peak travel periods and maintains safe bicycle circulation.
- Monitoring roadbed damage and timing for completing repairs.
- Preserving safe and convenient passage for bicyclists and pedestrians through/around construction areas.
- Creating methods for partial (i.e., single lane)/complete street closures (e.g., timing, signage, location and duration restrictions), if necessary.
- Identifying detour routes for roadways subject to partial/complete street closures.
- Identifying temporary UC Davis shuttle stops and detoured shuttle routes if existing stops or routes are affected.
- Identifying temporary SacRT bus stops and detoured bus routes, if existing stops or routes are affected.
- Developing criteria for use of flaggers and other traffic controls.
- Providing a point of contact for nearby residents, Sacramento Campus staff, students, and visitors, and other stakeholders to contact to obtain construction information and have questions answered.

The Construction TMP will be developed so that the following performance standards are achieved throughout project construction.

- Maintain emergency vehicle access to all buildings on the Sacramento Campus at all times.
- Maintain identified emergency vehicle routes to UC Davis Health medical facilities at all times. Notify appropriate contacts for UC Davis Health and/or emergency responders at least 24 hours prior to any construction-related partial/complete closures that may affect emergency vehicle routes, and provide clear identification of detours when necessary.
- Minimize construction traffic during morning and evening peak periods when street traffic on local and campus streets are highest.
- Close (i.e., partially or fully) any construction-related public roadways only during off-peak periods and provide appropriate construction signage, including detour routing.
- Limit detour routing to campus roadways or City collector and arterial roadways, such as Stockton Boulevard and Broadway, to the extent feasible. Include measures to minimize traffic increases on local residential roadways; this may include signage and law

enforcement presence during partial/complete closures to discourage through-traffic use of local residential roadways.

- Clear roadways, sidewalks, crosswalks, and bicycle facilities of debris (e.g., rocks) that could otherwise impede travel and impact public safety, and maintain them in this condition.

UC Davis will also consider any concurrent construction activity and other active Construction TMPs when reviewing new Construction TMPs for specific Long Range Development Plan implementation projects. This review will address the effects of simultaneous construction activity.

Rationale for Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure LRDP-TRA-5 would require prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (TMP) be prepared to the satisfaction of UC Davis Health and the City of Sacramento Department of Public Works for City-owned roadways.

3. Findings on Significant Environmental Impacts That Cannot be Avoided or Reduced to a Less Than Significant Level

FINDING: Based on the issue area assessment in the EIR, the University has determined that the Project will have significant impacts in the resource area discussed below, and that this impact cannot be avoided or reduced despite the incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. These findings are based on the discussion of impacts in the detailed issue area analyses in Volume 1, Section 3.11 of the EIR. For the significant and unavoidable impact identified below, the University has made a finding(s) pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21081. An explanation of the rationale for each finding is also presented below.

a) Noise

Impact NOI-1: Construction of the Project would generate increased ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity in excess of applicable standards (Final EIR Volume 1, Section 3.11.2, pages 3.11-13 through 3.11-19).

FINDING: The University finds that changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Project which mitigate significant effects on the environment from Impact NOI-1. Specifically, Mitigation Measure LRDP-NOI-1, set forth below, is feasible and is adopted to mitigate significant effects from Impact NOI-1. However, even with implementation of these measures, significant unavoidable impacts will occur related to construction noise. Therefore, the University finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make it infeasible to reduce Impact NOI-1 to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure LRDP-NOI-1: Implementation of Measures to Reduce Construction Noise

For construction activities associated with future projects under the 2020 LRDP Update, UC Davis will implement or incorporate the following noise reduction measures into construction specifications for the contractor(s) to implement during project construction:

1. Construction activities will be limited to daytime hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday, when feasible.
2. Pile driving will not occur outside of the daytime hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday.

3. All construction equipment used for future projects will be equipped with suitable exhaust and intake silencers in good working order. All construction equipment will be properly maintained and equipped with intake silencers and exhaust mufflers and/or engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturer recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds, if used, will be closed during equipment operation.
4. All construction equipment and equipment staging areas will be located as far as possible from nearby noise-sensitive land uses, and/or located such that existing or constructed noise attenuating features (e.g., temporary noise wall or blankets) block the line of sight between affected noise-sensitive land uses and construction staging areas, to the extent feasible.
5. Individual operations and techniques will be replaced with quieter procedures (e.g., using welding instead of riveting, mixing concrete offsite instead of onsite), where feasible and consistent with building codes and other applicable laws and regulations.
6. Stationary noise sources such as generators or pumps will be located as far as feasible from noise-sensitive land uses.
7. No less than 1 week prior to the start of construction activities at a particular location, notification will be provided to academic, administrative, and residential or noise-sensitive uses (such as schools) located within 500 feet of the construction site.
8. For any construction activity that must extend beyond the daytime hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on weekdays and Saturdays, and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sundays, the construction contractor for that project will ensure that noise levels at the nearest noise-sensitive land use do not exceed 55 dBA during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 50 dBA during the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., as feasible. In addition to measures described above, the following measures may also help achieve this performance standard:
 - a. Install temporary noise barriers as close as possible to the noise source or the receptor within the direct line-of-sight path between the noise source and nearby sensitive receptor(s). The barrier should be constructed of material that has a surface weight of at least 1 pound per square foot and has an acoustical rating of at least 25 STC, or Sound Transmission Class. This can include a temporary barrier constructed with plywood support on a wood frame, sound curtains supported on a frame, or other comparable material.
 - b. Use “quiet” gasoline-powered compressors or electrically powered compressors as well as electric rather than gasoline- or diesel-powered forklifts for small lifting, where feasible.
 - c. Prohibit idling of inactive construction equipment for prolonged periods (i.e., more than 2 minutes).
 - d. Retain a qualified noise specialist to conduct noise monitoring and ensure that noise reduction measures achieve the necessary reductions so that levels at the receiving land uses do not exceed 55 dBA during the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 50 dBA during the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

Rationale for Finding: Implementation of Mitigation Measure LRDP-NOI-1 would reduce construction exposure to noise-sensitive land uses and would therefore reduce the severity of construction noise impacts. However, it may not be possible to reduce construction noise occurring outside of the daytime exempt hours to below the allowable levels defined in the Sacramento City Code. Implementation of Mitigation Measure LRDP-NOI-1, which includes measures to reduce noise from construction activity, may reduce construction noise effects, but it is not feasible, in all cases

and during all construction activities, to ensure that noise levels would not result in excessive noise increases (e.g., a 10 dB increase, or perceived doubling of loudness). For example, temporary construction noise barriers such as constructed wood barriers or noise control blankets supported on frames or fences are proposed to be installed, which would help reduce noise from construction activity. However, unless the complete line of sight between the receptor and source is blocked, these barriers may not be effective in reducing noise. In addition, even if the line of sight is fully blocked, these barriers may only reduce noise by approximately 5–10 dB. Although the installation of such barriers will take place, these walls and barriers would not be expected to reduce noise from activities to below significance thresholds. Because proposed noise control measures may not reduce construction noise to less-than-significant levels, [construction noise impacts during daytime hours would be significant and unavoidable with implementation of Mitigation Measure LRDP-NOI-1.

E. FINDINGS ON PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

1. Alternatives Screened Out from Detailed Consideration in the EIR

For the Central Utility Plant Expansion Project, a range of alternatives were analyzed in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Section 4.4 of the EIR. The alternatives that were considered but ultimately dismissed include:

- **New Clinical Satellite Heat Recovery Plant Alternative (Continued Cogeneration with Existing Plant).** The concept for this alternative involves an all-electric satellite central energy plant at the north end of the campus. The plant would be designed as a chilled-water heat recovery plant to serve Clinical and Hospital loads, which are primarily in the north campus area. The primary goal of this option is to avoid increasing campus-related direct carbon emissions over and above existing levels. Without the new satellite, increased combined cooling, heat, and power (CCHP) plant heating and cooling loads would result in increased gas turbine power levels and an associated significant increase in fuel use and carbon emissions. The north satellite central plant would account for all campus load growth over and above existing campus thermal loads in the Clinical zone of the campus.

The north chilled-water heat recovery plant would be designed to provide needed campus cooling and heating capacity, over and above current loads. A separate hot-water distribution system would be installed at the north area of the campus, serving north-area hospital and medical-building loads. The north hot-water distribution system would be separate from the existing campus hot-water loop and operate at a much lower temperature compared to the existing system for overall heat recovery-system energy efficiency. The campus would continue to operate the existing CCHP cogeneration plant, without adding equipment for future campus capacity needs. The existing cogeneration plant would continue to operate until the end of its life. Then, an all-electric replacement plant of equivalent capacity would need to be built. This option would require one new cooling tower and five emergency generators.

This alternative would reduce the construction noise effects of the project on an existing elementary school, which is the closest sensitive receptor to the CUP site, and reduce the significant and unavoidable impact of the project related to construction noise effects on sensitive receptors on campus to a less-than-significant level. It would not reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the project related to the construction noise effects of the SMUD facilities.

This alternative was not selected for multiple reasons. Primarily, this option would be located near residents along V Street in the Elmhurst neighborhood, which would result in more severe impacts related to aesthetics, air quality and associated health risks, and noise. In addition, this option would serve only the main hospital; the proposed project is intended to serve the majority of the Sacramento Campus. The cost of running two plants would increase, and additional personnel would be required. Furthermore, it would have a large physical footprint, which could result in spacing issues that would conflict with some of the goals of the 2020 Long-Range Development Plan (LRDP) Update, such as appropriate facility adjacencies.

Because this alternative would not be consistent with UC policies, including the LRDP, and because it would result in greater impacts compared with the proposed project, this alternative was dismissed and not carried forward in the analysis in this EIR.

- **Electric Boilers with No TES Tanks Alternative.** The concept of this alternative is to shut down the existing CCHP cogeneration plant and convert it to a central chilled-water heat recovery plant with supplemental chillers and peaking electric boilers. Thermal energy storage (TES) for chilled water and hot water was not included for this option because of the potentially limited availability of land for large TES tanks.

Under this alternative, an annex central plant building would need to be constructed in the vicinity of the existing CCHP facility because the existing facility does not have adequate space for the equipment that would be needed. The annex central plant building would contain the heat recovery chillers, electric hot-water boilers, electrical switchgear, substations, larger emergency generators, and diesel fuel storage and related auxiliary mechanical/electrical equipment. Once overall conversion of the central plant is completed, the annex CUP would function as the heating plant for the campus; the existing CCHP facility would function as the cooling plant for the campus.

This alternative would have a smaller footprint than the proposed project, which would reduce some construction-related impacts. It would also reduce GHG emissions because it would be all electric. However, this alternative would not meet campus demand. Because this alternative would not meet project objectives (e.g., campus demand), it was dismissed and not carried forward in the analysis.

Gas Turbine Heat Load Following with No TES Tanks Alternative. Under this alternative, the existing CCHP cogeneration plant would continue operating, with a change in operation from electrical load following to heat load following. Most of the electricity would be purchased from SMUD. Plant capacity would be added as needed to cover campus long-range load growth. Although this alternative would have a smaller footprint than the proposed project, it would not meet campus demand with current technology and would be infeasible for engineering reasons (i.e., requiring constant generation of heating hot water through the cogeneration and gas-fired boilers causing more gas burning as the Campus grows). Because this alternative would not meet project objectives, and would be infeasible, this alternative was dismissed and not carried forward in the analysis in this EIR.

The University finds that all of the alternatives eliminated from further consideration in the Draft EIR are infeasible and impractical, would not meet most Project objectives and/or would not reduce or avoid any of the significant effects of the proposed Project, for the reasons detailed in Volume 1, Chapter 4, Section 4.4 of the EIR.

2. Alternatives Analyzed in the EIR

In compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project. The EIR's analysis examined the potential feasibility of each alternative, its environmental effects, and its ability to meet the basic Project objectives while reducing impacts to the environment. The alternatives analysis included analysis of a no-Project alternative and identified the environmentally superior alternative. The Draft EIR evaluated two alternatives to the Project:

Alternative 1: No Project.

Alternative 2: New Non-Clinical Satellite Heat Recovery Plant (Continued Cogeneration with Existing Plant).

Brief summaries of these alternatives and findings regarding these alternatives are provided below.

- ***Alternative 1: No Project Alternative:*** Under the No-Project Alternative, the CUP Expansion Project would not be constructed, and the CUP would continue operating the existing CCHP cogeneration plant. (See EIR Volume 1, Chapter 4, pages 4-5 through 4-8).

FINDING: Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(3), the University finds that the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including failure to meet basic Project objectives, render the No Project Alternative infeasible. Under the No Project Alternative, the CUP Expansion Project would not be constructed, and the CUP would continue operating the existing CCHP cogeneration plant. None of the Project objectives would be met because the Project would not be constructed. These include increasing the resiliency of utilities in the event of a utility outage to maintain care for the community in the Sacramento region; compliance with Health-Care Access and Information (HCAI) standards and requirements for health-care facilities; providing the utility load needed for campus growth, including the California Hospital Tower and 48X Complex; accommodating campus growth through 2035; furthering campus compliance with the UC Sustainable Practices Policy, including initiation of development of a more efficient operating utility plant to reduce GHGs and set the Sacramento Campus on a path to carbon-free operations; and demolishing outdated spaces to achieve seismic safety and remove buildings that cannot be operated efficiently or renovated. The University therefore rejects this alternative for the reasons listed above.

- ***Alternative 2: New Non-Clinical Satellite Heat Recovery Plant (Continued Cogeneration with Existing Plant):*** Under Alternative 2, the plant concept is similar to that of the New Clinical Satellite Heat Recovery Plant Alternative; however, the new all-electric satellite central plant would be smaller with respect to capacity, non-Clinical, and located in the campus education core area north of Parking Lot 17. Only existing and new non-medically related buildings, such as teaching facilities, laboratory facilities, and administrative offices, would be served by this plant. The existing CCHP plant would continue to serve the greater campus and associated HCAI loads. (Final EIR Volume 1, Chapter 4, pages 4-4 and 4-5).

FINDING: Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines section 15091(a)(3), the University finds that the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including failure to meet Project objectives, render the Campus Core Non-HCAI Satellite Heat Recovery Plant (Continued Cogeneration with Existing Plant) Alternative infeasible. Alternative 2, Campus Core Non-HCAI Satellite Heat Recovery Plant (Continued Cogeneration with Existing Plant), would reduce construction noise impacts at the existing on-

campus sensitive receptor to a less-than-significant level. Although this alternative could result in greater operational noise impacts, it is anticipated that the impacts could be reduced by noise-reduction mitigation. However, the alternative would not reduce the significant and unavoidable construction noise impacts associated with the SMUD facilities. Although Alternative 2 would reduce the construction noise impact of the proposed project, it would increase impacts related to air quality, energy, and GHG emissions and would have slightly greater impacts on other resources because Alternative 2 would have a larger project footprint.

Because Alternative 2 would reduce a significant unavoidable impact of the proposed project while reducing GHG impacts compared to the No-Project Alternative, Alternative 2 is the environmentally superior alternative as discussed in Section 4.7, *Environmentally Superior Alternative* of the Draft EIR.

F. FINDING ON RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR, REVISIONS TO THE FINAL EIR, AND OTHER FINDINGS

Volume 3, Chapter 2 of the Final EIR includes the comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments. The focus of the responses to comments is on the disposition of significant environmental issues as raised in the comments, as specified by CEQA Guidelines § 15088(b). The University finds that responses to comments made on the Draft EIR and revisions to the Final EIR merely clarify and amplify the analysis presented in the document and do not trigger the need to recirculate per CEQA Guidelines §15088.5(b).

FINDING: The University finds that no significant new information was added to the Draft EIR after the public review period. The University specifically finds that: no new significant environmental impact would result from the Project or from the implementation of a mitigation measure; no substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result, or if such an increase would result, the University has adopted mitigation measures to reduce the impact to a level of insignificance; the University has not declined to adopt any feasible Project alternative or mitigation measures considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the Project; and the Draft EIR is not so fundamentally and basically inadequate in nature that it precluded meaningful public review.

III. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed Project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the Project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed Project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered “acceptable” (CEQA Guidelines § 15093). When the lead agency approves a Project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the Final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency must state in writing the specific reason to support its actions based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record. (Id.)

Having (i) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, (ii) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts, and (iii) balanced the benefits of the Project against its significant and unavoidable impacts, the University finds that the Project’s benefits outweigh and override its significant unavoidable impacts for the reasons stated below. Each benefit set forth below constitutes an overriding

consideration warranting approval of the Project, independent of the other benefits, despite each and every unavoidable impact.

- The Project will increase the resiliency of utilities in the event of a utility outage to maintain care for the community in the Sacramento region.
- The Project will comply with Health-Care Access and Information (HCAI) standards and requirements for health-care facilities.
- The Project will provide the utility load needed for campus growth, including the California Hospital Tower and 48X Complex.
- The Project will accommodate campus growth through the year 2035 to support UC Davis Health's teaching, research and community engagement missions in the most efficient manner, with the least amount of disruption to operations.
- The Project will further campus compliance with the UC Sustainable Practices Policy, including initiation of development of a more efficient operating utility plant to reduce GHGs and set the Sacramento Campus on a path to carbon-free operations.
- The Project will utilize efficient land use planning on the Sacramento Campus by maximizing the project site to the extent feasible and ensure appropriate facility adjacencies.
- The Project will make roadway improvements to ensure safe and easy access by patients, visitors, staff, residents, and partners between campus districts, while minimizing potential conflicts among pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists.
- The Project will address code-required utility upgrades (including seismic upgrades) and expand capacity to ensure continued, reliable support of operations at the Sacramento campus and provide infrastructure to allow the future installation of carbon-free operational equipment.

IV. APPROVALS

The University hereby takes the following actions:

1. The University adopts as conditions of approval of the Project all mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the University.
2. The University adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project.
3. The University adopts the Findings in their entirety, including the Statement of Overriding Considerations.
4. Having certified 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 University hereby approves the Project and directs staff to prepare and file a Notice of Determination for the Project.