TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
	Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
4.1 Aesthetics								
4.1-1 The proposed UCP would alter the visual character of the UCP area and could be visually incompatible with surrounding land uses.	S	S	Policies TO 1.1 through 1.3, LU 2.3, 3.2, 5.10, 5.14, 6.7, 6.8, 7.15, 7.18, 7.23, 7.24, 9.1 through 9.4, 9.7, 10.6, and 10.7, IE 5.1 through IE 5.3, IW 9.4, IW 9.6, IW 12.8, IW 12.9, IT 1.1 and IT 1.4	S	S	None available	SU	SU
4.1-2 The proposed UCP could intrude into major view corridors and adversely affect scenic resources.	S	S	Policies V 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4	S	S	None available	SU	SU
4.1-3 The proposed UCP would create a new source of nighttime light and glare in the UCP area.	S	S	Policies V 2.1 through 2.4	S	S	None available	SU	SU
4.1-4 Development of the proposed UCP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to alteration of the visual character of the UCP area, and to visual incompatibility with surrounding land uses in the vicinity of the UCP area.	S	S	Policies TO 1.1 through 1.2b, LU 2.3, 3.2, 5.10, 5.14, 6.7, 6.8, 7.15, 7.18, 7.23, 7.24, 9.1 through 9.4, 9.7, 10.6, and 10.7	S	S	None available	SU	SU
4.1-5 Development of the proposed UCP, in combination with other cumulative development, would contribute to adverse effects on major view corridors and scenic resources in the area.	S	S	Policies V 1.1 through 1.4, LU 9.7	S	S	None available	SU	SU
4.1-6 Development of the proposed UCP, in combination with other cumulative development, would create nighttime light and glare in the UCP area.	S	S	Policies V 2.1 through 2.4	S	S	None available	SU	SU
4.2 Agricultural Resources								
4.2-1 Development of the UCP area	S	S	Policies A.1,-and LU 9.10	S	S	None available	SU	SU

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

	Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation		Residual Significance	
		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015			Buildout	2015
	could result in the conversion of Important Farmland, including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance.									
4.2-2	**Development of the proposed UCP could expose future residents to nuisances associated with agricultural operations and could expose farmers to nuisances associated with urban uses.**	S	S	Policies A.2, 3, and 4.1.	LS	LS	None required		LS	LS
4.2-3	**The proposed UCP could be inconsistent with General Plan Agricultural policies.**	S	S	Policies A 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, and 3.14, AA 1.1 through 1.3, and 2.1 through 2.3.	LS	LS	None required		LS	LS
4.2-4	**Development of the proposed UCP, in combination with other cumulative development in Merced County, would contribute to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance.**	S	S	Policies AA 2.1 and 2.2	S	S	None available		SU	SU
4.2-5	**Development of the proposed UCP, in combination with other development in the County, could conflict with agricultural zoning or result in the cancellation of Williamson Act contracts.**	LS	LS	Policies AA 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3	LS	LS	None required		LS	LS
	4.3 Air Quality									
4.3-1	**Project-related construction activities would generate PM_{10}.**	S	S	Policy AQ 5.1	LS	LS	4.3-1	Compliance with the following SJVUAPCD mitigation measure listed in Table 6-3 of the GAAMAQI would further reduce dust created during construction	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
	Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
						activities:		
						▪ Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph; ▪ Install sand bags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with slopes greater than one percent; ▪ Wash off all trucks and equipment prior to leaving the site or install wheel washers for all exiting trucks; ▪ Install windbreaks at windward sides of construction areas; ▪ Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds exceed 20 mph; ▪ Limit area subject to excavation, grading and other construction activity at any time.		
4.3-2 Construction activities would generate NO_x, ROG and CO emissions.	S	S	Policies AQ 5.2 through 5.4	S	S	4.3-2 Construction contracts shall include the following specifications: ▪ Minimize idling time to a maximum of ten minutes when construction equipment is not in use; ▪ Employ construction activity management techniques such as extending the construction period outside the ozone season of May through October, reducing the number of hours of construction and scheduling construction activities during off peak hours;	SU	SU

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
	Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
						▪ Tuning engines to manufacturer's specifications; ▪ When feasible, schedule equipment usage to avoid simultaneous use of equipment; ▪ When feasible, use construction equipment with new technology that reduces the amount of NO_x, ROG, CO, or PM_{10} emissions; ▪ To the extent feasible, construction equipment will employ the latest technology, as determined by the SJVUAPCD, to minimize the amount of diesel particulate matter generated during construction activities; ▪ Construction equipment rated greater than 100 horsepower shall have, to the extent feasible, diesel exhaust controlled by the use of catalyst-based diesel particulate filters.		
4.3-3 Project-related traffic would increase CO concentrations at specific intersections.	S	LS	Policies AQ 2.2, 2.4, 2.5; LU 4.1, 3.3, 5.8 and 5.16	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.3-4 Operational emissions associated with the UCP area would exceed SJVUAPCD standards.	S	S	Policies AQ 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 6.1, and 7.1; LU 3.1, 3.3, 5.8, and 5.16, IE 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3	S	S	4.3-4(a) Outdoor electrical outlets shall be installed in the front and backyards of all housing units. (b) If feasible, all housing units will include, as part of the purchase, an electric lawn mower	SU	SU
4.3-5 Future residents of the UCP area could be exposed to pesticide spray drift from adjacent agricultural operations.	LS	LS	Policy A 4.1	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
	Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
4.3-6 Future residents could be exposed to toxic air contaminants (TAC) from stationary sources within the UCP area.	LS	LS	Policy AQ 3.1	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.3-7 Future residents could be exposed to odors from sources within the UCP area.	S	S	Policies AQ 3.1, A 2.2, and A 4.1	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.3-8 Future residents of the UCP area could be exposed to odors and dust from adjacent land uses.	S	S	Policies A 2.2 and A 4.1	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.3-9 Project emissions, in combination with UC Merced and other development in the County, could contribute to the degradation of air quality.	S	S	Policies AQ 4.1, 4.3, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, T 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.5, 5.5, 5.6, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, and 7.4	S	S	None available	SU	SU
4.3-10 Project-generated traffic, in combination with other cumulative development, would increase CO levels at local intersections.	LS	LS	Policies AQ 2.4 and 2.5; Policies LU 4.1, 3.3, 5.8, and 5.16; Policies T 7.1, 7.3, and 7.4.	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.3-11 Operational emissions would exceed ROG and NO_x standards.	S	S	Policies AQ 2.4 and 2.5, LU 3.1, 3.3, 5.8, and 5.16	S	S	None available	SU	SU
4.3-12 Development in the UCP area in conjunction with UC Merced and other cumulative development in the vicinity, could generate unacceptable cumulative TAC health risks.	LS	LS	None	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.4 Biological Resources								
4.4-1 The proposed UCP would result in substantial adverse effects to federally-protected wetlands.	S	S	Policies PA 1.1 through 1.6	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.4-2 The proposed UCP would result in substantial adverse effects to 20.7 acres of vernal pools, swales, and seasonal wetlands (a subset of the	S	S	Policies PA 1.1 through 1.6 and PA 2.1 through 2.3	LS	LS	4.4-2 The County shall ensure that at least 559 acres of upland annual grassland is preserved in conjunction with and to support at least 62.1 acres of	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
	Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
38.4 acres of jurisdictional waters discussed in Impact 4.4-1) and adverse effects to associated special-status species.						potential vernal pool fairy shrimp aquatic habitat and at least 1.86 acres of occupied succulent owl's clover habitat (for a total of 623 acres) The County shall also ensure that at least 9.3 acres of the above aquatic habitat is occupied by midvalley fairy shrimp and at least 32.3 acres is occupied by California linderiella. The County shall also ensure that at least 27.3 acres of natal pond habitat for California tiger salamander is preserved, restored, or created. Appropriate existing vernal pool or stock pond habitat within the above preserved upland annual grassland may be used to meet this minimum performance standard (either in total or in part). Any remaining mitigation obligation may be accomplished through the preservation, restoration (e.g., seasonal eradication of introduced fishes and bullfrog), or creation of stock ponds in contiguous rangeland that is within 0.4 miles of known occupied natal ponds.		
4.4-3 The proposed UCP would result in substantial adverse effects to 17.7 acres of freshwater marsh, wooded channel, drainages, and stockpond (a subset of the 38.4 acres of federally-protected wetlands	S	S	Policies PA 1.1 through 1.6; and PA 2.1 through 2.3	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation		Residual Significance	
	Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015			Buildout	2015
discussed in Impact 4.4-1) and adverse effects to associated special-status species.									
4.4-4 The proposed UCP would result in the loss of annual grasslands and adverse effects to associated special-status avian species.	S	S	Policies PA 2.1 through 2.3; and Policy A 3.1	S	S	4.4-4(a)	The County shall ensure that Swainson's hawk foraging habitat is preserved off-site in sufficient quality and quantity, as determined through consultation with the CDFG, to mitigate for the loss resulting from the proposed UCP. The preservation of annual grasslands (through Policy PA 2.3) that are suitable as foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk shall be located within 10 miles of a current or historic Swainson's hawk nest site (consistent with CDFG guidance).	LS	LS
						(b)	The County shall require pre-construction surveys to identify active raptor nests prior to the onset of construction activities within 1,000 feet of any ground disturbing activities (i.e., construction site). The pre-construction surveys will be conducted in accordance with USFWS and/or CDFG guidelines. If no active raptor nests are identified within 1,000 feet of the construction site, no further mitigation would be necessary. If active nests are found within 1,000 feet of the construction site, the		

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation		Residual Significance	
	Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015			Buildout	2015
							CDFG shall be consulted to determine appropriate mitigation measures to minimize the effect. At a minimum, construction shall be delayed within an appropriate buffer zone, as determined by consultation with CDFG, until the young have fledged.		
4.4-5 The proposed UCP would result in the loss of annual grassland and adverse effects on associated special-status mammal species.	S	S	Policies PA 2.1 through 2.3	LS	LS	4.4-5	Project applicants shall conduct surveys for dens/burrows that could be occupied by dispersing San Joaquin kit fox prior to any ground-disturbing activities within the UCP area or at off-site infrastructure improvement sites. The surveys shall be conducted within two weeks or less of any ground-disturbing activities. If dens/burrows meeting the criteria suitable for use by San Joaquin kit fox are found, the dens/burrows shall be cleared using the methodologies that are consistent with those described in the June 1999 Standardized Recommendations for Protection of the San Joaquin Kit Fox Prior to or During Ground Disturbance.	LS	LS
4.4-6 The proposed UCP would result in the loss of annual grasslands and adverse effects on associated special-status plant species.	S	S	Policies PA 2.1 through 2.3; and Policy A 3.1	S	S	4.4-6	Preservation of existing shining navarretia populations shall be accomplished through the conveyance of conservation easements on off-site lands that support the taxon. The easements shall include necessary land	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts		Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation		Residual Significance	
		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015			Buildout	2015
								restrictions, as recommended by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game, that provide for the long-term ecological integrity of the land supporting the preserved populations. A minimum preservation ratio of 5:1 shall be utilized to compensate for the loss of shining navarretia populations within the UCP area.		
4.4-7	**The proposed UCP could result in the loss of annual grasslands, agricultural land, and seasonal wetland habitats and adverse effects on associated special-status species due to construction of off-site infrastructure.**	S	S	Policies PA 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, 2.1, and 2.3	LS	LS	None required		LS	LS
4.4-8	**The proposed UCP could indirectly affect special-status species, and the habitats that support these species.**	S	S	Policies PA 1.1 through 1.6; PA 2.1 through 2.3; and PA 3.1 through 3.6; IW 5.9, 8.2 through 8.4, 8.6, 8.7, 8.9, 8.10, 9.6, 12.3, and 12.4; LU 3.1, 3.2, 9.1 through 9.4, and 9.9; PP 1.5, 3.1, 4.1, and 4.2; AQ 5.1 through 5.4; N 2.6; W 1.1; PS 3.5; and ISW 1.2.	LS	LS	4.4-8	The UCP shall provide its fair share (as determined in consultation with the University of California) toward the annual funding necessary to maintain enforcement of prohibitions against trespass in the watershed subbasin supporting Conservancy fairy shrimp. The UCP's contribution to the annual funding shall be provided to the entity within the University of California that has primary responsibility for managing the preserve lands that encompass the Conservancy fairy shrimp watershed subbasin. The prohibitions against trespass in this watershed subbasin shall be enforced	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts		Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
							by the University of California, consistent with the Mitigation Measure 4.4-7(c) in the LRDP FEIR and with the Biological Opinion.		
4.4-9	**The proposed UCP could interrupt potential movement of San Joaquin kit fox.**	LS	LS	Policies PA 2.1 through 2.3	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.4-10	**The proposed UCP would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.**	NI	NI	None	NA	NA	None required	NI	NI
4.4-11	**Development of the UCP, in conjunction with UC Merced and other cumulative development, would result in the loss or adverse modification of important native plant and wildlife habitat, including wetlands, vernal pool habitat, alkaline clay playa habitat, and annual grassland habitat, and adverse effects to special-status species associated with these habitats.**	S	S	Policies PA 1.1 through 1.6 and PA 2.1 through 2.3	S	S	4.4-11 Implement Mitigation Measures 4.4-2 and 4.4-4(a) and (b).	SU	LS
4.5 Cultural Resources									
4.5-1	**Development under the UCP could disturb or destroy paleontological resources that could be present in the UCP area.**	S	S	Policies C 1.3 and 2.1	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.5-2	**The proposed UCP could result in damage to or destruction of unidentified prehistoric cultural resources.**	S	S	Policies C1.1 through 1.3	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
	Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
4.5-3 The UCP could result in damage to, or destruction of, historical sites and/or artifacts.	LS	LS	None	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.5-4 The proposed UCP would require construction of offsite infrastructure that could damage or destroy undiscovered archaeological and/or historical resources.	LS	LS	Policies C 1.1 through 1.3, and 2.1	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.5-5 Cumulative-plus-project development could damage or destroy unidentified prehistoric and historic cultural resources.	S	S	Policies C 1.1 through 1.3 and 2.1	S	S	4.5-5 The County shall document that appropriate cultural resource surveys and measures to protect cultural resources, if present, are completed prior to construction of offsite improvements outside of the UCP area.	LS	LS
4.6 Geology, Soils, Seismicity, and Mineral Resources								
4.6-1 Development of the proposed UCP could expose people and structures to hazards associated with seismic-related groundshaking.	LS	LS	Policies S 1.1 and 1.2	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.6-2 Development of the proposed UCP could result in increased soil erosion during construction or occupancy.	LS	LS	None	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.6-3 Development of the proposed UCP would expose people and structures to hazards associated with unstable soils.	LS	LS	Policies S 1.1 through 1.3	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
	Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
4.6-4 The proposed UCP, in combination with other development in Merced County, could expose additional people to potential seismic hazards.	LS	LS	Policies S 1.1 through 1.3	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.6-5 The proposed UCP, in combination with other development in Merced County, could cause soil erosion.	LS	LS	None	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.6-6 The proposed UCP, as well as other development in Merced County, could involve building construction on potentially unstable soils.	LS	LS	Policies S 1.1through 1.3	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.7 Hazards And Hazardous Materials								
4.7-1 Implementation of the proposed UCP could create a health hazard to site workers, the public, and the environment due to exposure of contaminated soil and groundwater.	PS	PS	Policies S 3.1 and 3.2	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.7-2 Construction of the proposed University Community would involve the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials, which could be a safety hazard for people living and working within the University Community.	LS	LS	None	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts		Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
4.7-3	**Implementation of the proposed UCP would involve the use, storage, and transportation of hazardous materials, which could be a safety hazard for people living and working within the University Community.**	LS	LS	Policies S 4.1 and 4.2	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.7-4	**Uses within the proposed UCP could emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.**	LS	LS	Policies S 3.1, 3.2, and 4.1	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.7-5	**The proposed UCP could use treated wastewater for irrigation, which could be a health and safety hazard.**	PS	PS	Policies IW 4.6, 5.5, 5.6, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.10, 10.2, and 13.3	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.7-6	**The health and safety of people living and working within the proposed UCP area could be affected by activities at the UC Merced campus involving radioactive materials, biohazardous materials, and laboratory animals.**	LS	LS	None	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.7-7	**Implementation of the proposed UCP adjacent to a private airstrip could create a safety hazard for people residing or working in the UCP area.**	LS	LS	Policy AS 1.1	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.7-8	**Implementation of the proposed UCP could expose people and structures to wildland fires.**	LS	LS	Policies S 2.3 and 5.1 through 5.3	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts		Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
4.7-9	**The presence of the Fairfield and Le Grand Canals could pose safety hazards for people residing within the University Community.**	PS	PS	Policies LU 9.7 through 9.9	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.7-10	**The proposed UCP, in combination with other development in northeastern Merced County, would increase the volume and type of hazardous materials used, transported, stored, and disposed.**	LS	LS	Policies S 3.1, 3.2, 4.1 and 4.2	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.7-11	**The proposed UCP, in combination with other development in northeastern Merced County, could increase the potential for wildland fires to occur.**	LS	LS	Policies S 2.3 and 5.1 through 5.3	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality									
4.8-1	**Surface runoff from construction sites at the UCP area would include increased amounts of silt and sediment that could degrade receiving water quality.**	LS	LS	None	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.8-2	**Dewatering activities performed during construction of the proposed UCP, as well as groundwater pump tests, could result in the discharge of sediment or pollutants into receiving waters, potentially affecting water quality.**	LS	LS	None	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.8-3	**Implementation of the University Community Plan could increase the volume of groundwater extracted from the regional aquifer, which could deplete**	LS	LS	Policies IW 1.1, 1.2, 4.3, 4.6, 5.1, 5.2, 5.4, 5.5, 8.1, 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4, 12.6, and 12.7	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts		Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
	groundwater supplies and lower the groundwater table.								
4.8-4	**New impervious surfaces associated with development of the proposed UCP could affect groundwater recharge potential.**	LS	LS	Policies IW 4.3, 8.8, 9.2, and 12.7	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.8-5	**Pumping of groundwater from the new wells to meet projected demand for the UCP could lower water levels and quality in adjacent wells.**	S	S	Policies IW 8.1, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4, and 12.6.	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.8-6	**Development of the proposed UCP could increase sediment and urban contaminants, which could adversely affect receiving water quality.**	PS	PS	Policies IW 8.7, 8.9, 8.10, and 13.6	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.8-7	**Development of the proposed UCP would alter local drainage patterns and could increase the rate and volume of stormwater runoff, resulting in localized flooding.**	S	S	Policies IW 1.9, 1.10, 4.7, 11.10, 11.11, 12.3, and 12.4	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.8-8	**The proposed UCP could use treated and recycled wastewater for irrigation, which could affect surface and groundwater quality.**	LS	LS	Policies IW 4.6, 5.5, 5.6, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.6, 10.2, and 13.3.	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.8-9	**People or structures at the UCP area could be exposed to flooding if the levees of the Fairfield and/or Le Grand Canals were to fail.**	S	S	Policies IW 1.9, 1.14, 11.10, and 11.11; S 2.1 and 2.2	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.8-10	**Surface runoff from construction sites at the UCP area, in combination with other development in Merced County in the San Joaquin River Basin, would include increased amounts**	LS	LS	None	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

	Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
	of sediment and other constituents that could degrade receiving water quality.								
4.8-11	**Implementation of the University Community Plan, in combination with the UC Merced campus and other development in the Merced region, would increase the volume of groundwater extracted from the regional aquifer, which could deplete groundwater supplies and lower the groundwater table.**	LS	LS	Policies IW 1.1, 1.2, 4.1, 4.3, 4.6, 5.1, 5.2, 5.4, 5.5, 8.1, 11.1, 11.2, 11.3, 11.4, 12.6, and 12.7	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.8-12	**Development of the proposed UCP, in combination with other development in Merced County in the San Joaquin River Basin, could result in increased generation of sediment and urban contaminants, which could adversely affect receiving water quality.**	S	S	Policies IW 8.7, 8.9, 8.10, and 13.6	S	S	4.8-12 The County shall develop Best Management Practices and prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and a stormwater monitoring program consistent with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Phase 2 Permit criteria.	LS	LS
4.8-13	**The proposed UCP, in combination with other development, could affect water quality due to the discharge of wastewater or the use of reclaimed water.**	LS	LS	Policies IW 4.6, 5.5, 5.6, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.6, 10.2, and 13.3.	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.8-14	**The proposed UCP, in combination with other development that drains to Bear Creek, would increase the rate of stormwater runoff from newly created impervious surfaces, potentially resulting in localized flooding.**	S	S	Policies IW 1.9, 1.14, 4.7, 11.10, 11.11, 12.3, and 12.4	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts		Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation		Residual Significance	
		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015			Buildout	2015
4.8-15	**Implementation of the UCP, in combination with other Merced County and City of Merced development contributing stormwater runoff volumes to Bear Creek, could exacerbate flooding conditions by increasing water surface elevations in areas subject to 100-year flood hazard.**	S	S	Policies IW 12.3 and 12.4	S	S	4.8-15	The County shall work with the MID, and the City of Merced to update the Merced County Critical Area Flooding and Drainage Plan to identify a strategy for managing storm drainage runoff associated with future development within the Merced area. The plan update shall include at a minimum: existing hydrologic and hydraulic conditions; identification of base flood elevations that meet FEMA 44 CFR Part 60 requirements, if such data have not been developed, and a process to evaluate the one-foot cumulative increase criteria; estimates of future peak flows and volumes based on anticipated land uses; performance standards for new development that address both peak flows and volumes while downstream conditions are not worsened; strategies to coordinate the development of local storm drainage and flood protection improvements with Merced County Streams Group projects; and mechanisms to update or revise the plan as needed as new information becomes available.	LS	LS
4.8-16	**People or structures at the UCP area, in combination with other development in Merced County located adjacent to the Fairfield or Le Grand Canals, could be exposed to flooding if the canal were to fail or if their conveyance**	S	S	Policies IW 11.10 and 11.11, S 2.1 and 2.2	S	S	4.8-16	MID and the County shall coordinate to ensure that additional stormwater drainage systems do not add flows into the Fairfield Canal that would exceed the canal's capacity restrictions, potentially creating levee failure or overtopping conditions	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

	Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
	capacity were exceeded due to cumulative flows.						downstream of the UCP area.		
				4.9 Land Use					
4.9-1	**The proposed UCP would include land use designations that could result in the establishment of incompatible land uses adjacent to and within the University Community.**	S	S	Policies A 1.2, 1.3, and 3.1, N 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.7, AS 1.1, and V 2.1 and 2.2	S	S	None available	SU	LS
4.9-2	**The modification of the SUDP boundaries could be inconsistent with General Plan goals or policies.**	LS	LS	Policies A 2.1 and 3.1, LU 4.2, 4.3, and 4.7, IW 2.1, 8.3, 8.4, and IE 1.1	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.9-3	**The proposed UCP could result in actions that might be inconsistent with Merced County LAFCO policies.**	LS	LS	Policies A 2. 1and 3.1, LU 4.2, 4.7, and 4.3, IW 1.1, 1.2, 1.8, 2.1, 8.3, 8.4, and 11.5, IE 1.1, and AA 2.1.	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
				4.10 Noise					
4.10-1	**Sensitive receptors within the UCP area could be exposed to noise levels that exceed the County's noise standards.**	S	S	Policies N 1.1, 1.2, 2.1 through 2.5, and 3.1 through 3.3	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.10-2	**The proposed UCP includes development of noise sensitive uses that could encroach on existing noise sources, and therefore, be exposed to unacceptable noise levels.**	S	S	Policies LU 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5, and N 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3.	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.10-3	**The proposed UCP would generate increased vehicular traffic on the regional road networks which would result in an increase in the ambient noise levels.**	S	S	Policies N 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4 and LU 5.16 and 5.19, and T 1.2, 4.1, and 4.3	S	S	4.10-3 The County shall construct barriers and/or retrofit affected homes with noise attenuation measures (e.g., sound-rated windows) necessary to achieve a 45 L_{dn} interior noise level.	SU	SU
4.10-4	**Construction of the proposed UCP would include activities that could**	S	S	Policy N 2.6	S	S	4.10-4 Construction contractors shall comply with the following or an	SU	SU

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
	Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
result in substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels.						comply with the following or an equivalent noise control program: ▪ All noise-producing project equipment and vehicles using internal combustion engines shall be equipped with exhaust mufflers and air-inlet silencers where appropriate, in good operating condition that meet or exceed original factory specification. ▪ Mobile or fixed "package" equipment (e.g. arc-welders, air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment. ▪ All mobile or fixed noise producing equipment used on the project, that is regulated for noise output by local, state or federal agency, shall comply with such regulation while engaged in project-related activities. ▪ Electrically powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal combustion powered equipment, where practicable. ▪ Material stockpiles and mobile equipment staging, parking and maintenance areas shall be located as far as practicable from noise-sensitive receptors.		

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts		Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation		Residual Significance	
		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015			Buildout	2015
								▪ The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, and bells shall be for safety warning purposes only. No project-related public address loudspeaker, two-way radio, or music system shall be audible at any adjacent noise-sensitive receptor except for emergency use. ▪ The erection of temporary noise barriers will be considered where project activity is unavoidably close to noise-sensitive receptors.		
4.10-5	**Construction of the proposed UCP would involve activities that could generate ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.**	S	S	None	S	S	4.10-5	Limit groundborne vibration due to construction activities to 0.2 in/sec velocity (limit of potential for damage to structures) in the vertical direction at sensitive receptors. For construction adjacent to highly sensitive uses, apply additional measures as feasible, including advance notice to occupants of sensitive facilities to ensure precautions are taken in those facilities to protect ongoing activities from the effects of vibration.	LS	LS
4.10-6	**Development of the UCP, in combination with other development in the County, would generate increased vehicular traffic on the regional road network which would result in an increase in ambient noise levels.**	S	S	Policies T 2.1, N 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4	S	LS	4.10-6	Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-3	SU	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts		Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
4.10-7	**Development of the UCP would contribute to cumulative increases in non-traffic noise at land uses within and near the UCP.**	S	S	Policies N 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.10-8	**Construction of the proposed UCP, in combination with other development in the County, could result in a substantial temporary or period increase in ambient noise levels.**	S	S	Policy N 2.6	S	S	4.10-8 Implement Mitigation Measures 4.10-4 and 4.10-5.	SU	SU
4.12 Public Services									
4.12-1	**The proposed UCP would increase demand for Sheriff's Department services.**	S	S	Policies PS 1.1 through 1.5, 2.1, and 2.2	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.12-2	**Cumulative Development within Merced County, in combination with the proposed UCP, would result in increased demands for Sheriff's Department services.**	S	S	Policies PS 1.1 through 1.5, 2.1, and 2.2	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.12-3	**The proposed UCP would require additional fire protection services.**	S	S	Policies PS 3.1 through 3.5	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.12-4	**Cumulative Development within Merced County, in combination with the proposed UCP, would result in increased demands for fire protection services.**	LS	LS	Policies PS 3.1 through 3.5	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.12-5	**The proposed UCP would require the expansion of existing schools and construction of new elementary schools and middle schools to accommodate the additional school children generated by the proposed UCP.**	LS	LS	Policies PE1.1 through 1.3	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.12-6	**Cumulative development within the City of Merced, in combination**	LS	LS	Policies PE 1.1 through 1.4	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

	Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
	with the proposed UCP, would require the construction of new schools.								
4.12-7	**The proposed UCP would result in the need for additional library facilities.**	S	S	Policies PLC 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, and 2.2	LS	LS	4.12-7 The County shall ensure that the County Library's level of service does not fall below the current service level.	LS	LS
4.12-8	**Cumulative development within Merced County, in combination with the proposed UCP, will result in increased demand for libraries.**	S	S	Policies PLC 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, and 2.2	LS	LS	4.12-8 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.12-7.	LS	LS
4.12-9	**The proposed UCP could require the expansion of existing hospitals and construction of new hospitals to accommodate the additional population generated by the proposed UCP.**	LS	LS	Policies PHS 1.1 through 1.3	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.12-10	**The proposed UCP, in conjunction with cumulative development in Merced County, will result in increased demand for hospitals.**	LS	LS	None	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
	4.13 Recreation								
4.13-1	**The proposed UCP would increase the demand for community parks and recreation facilities and require the construction of new parks.**	LS	LS	Policies PP1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 4.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 5.1 through 5.6, 7.1, and 7.2	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.13-2	**The proposed UCP would increase the use of Lake Yosemite Regional Park and could result in the physical deterioration of the Park.**	S	S	Policies PP 1.1, ALY 2.3, 2.6, and 3.2	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.13-3	**The proposed UCP would eliminate a portion of the Merced Hills Golf Course.**	S	S	Policies ALY 3.3-	S	S	None available	SU	SU

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts		Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
4.13-4	**The proposed UCP would, in combination with other development in Merced County including UC Merced, contribute to demand for community parks and recreation facilities and require the construction of new community parks.**	LS	LS	Policies PP 1.1, 5.2, 1.3, and 2.1	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.13-5	**The proposed UCP, in combination with other development in Merced County, including UC Merced, would contribute to the cumulative increase in the use of Lake Yosemite Regional Park and could result in the physical deterioration of the Park .**	S	S	Policies ALY 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1 through 2.5, 3.1, and 3.3	S	S	None available	SU	SU
4.13-6	**The proposed UCP, in combination with the UC Merced campus, would eliminate the Merced Hills Golf Course.**	S	S	Policies ALY 3.3	S	S	None available	SU	SU
4.14 Transportation									
4.14-1	**The proposed UCP would increase traffic congestion on local and regional roads outside of the UCP area.**	S	LS	Policies T 1.1, 1.5, 6.1, 7.1, 7.3, 8.1, 8.2	S	LS	4.14-1 Development under the UCP shall contribute its fair share toward the annual monitoring of traffic conditions along major approach routes to the UCP area and shall contribute its fair share toward implementation of interim improvements as warranted.	LS	LS
4.14-2	**Project-related traffic could result in unacceptable levels of service at intersections and streets within the UCP area.**	S	S	Policies T 1.1 through 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1 through 3.4, 3.6, and 7.1 through 7.4	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
	Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
4.14-3 UCP-generated transit use would place additional demand on regional and local transit services, and would depend on high levels of transit service connecting the Community with the UC Merced campus and major destinations within Merced County.	S	S	Policies T 3.2, 5.1, through 5.6	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.14-4 The proposed UCP would generate regional bicycle and pedestrian travel on routes within the Community and linking the University Community to the UC Merced campus and many other parts of the County.	S	S	Policies T 8.1, 8.2, 8.3	LS	LS	4.14-4 Merced County will, and the City of Merced can and should, ensure adequate maintenance of the existing path along Lake Road and other regional bicycle and pedestrian facilities that provide access to the proposed UCP.	LS	LS
4.14-5 The proposed UCP could experience unacceptable emergency vehicle response times because of traffic circulation constraints that might reduce speeds.	S	S	Policies T 1.1 through 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.6, 7.1 through 7.3, and 8.1	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.14-6 The proposed UCP would generate demand for new parking.	S	S	Policies T 1.2, 5.1 through 5.6, 6.4, 6.6, 6.7, and 7.4	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.14-7 The proposed UCP, in combination with the UC Merced campus and other development in Merced County, would increase congestion on local and regional roads.	S	S	Policy T 1.1	S	S	4.14-7(a) UCP development shall contribute its fair share toward the total cost of the regional improvements identified in this EIR as mitigation for significant project impacts, as listed below, as well as toward the Funded and Tier 1 improvements listed in the July 19, 2001 RTP for which existing and future funding from local, regional and State sources falls short of the full project cost.	SU	2015: LS 2025: LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
	Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
						▪ Highway 59, widen to 4 lanes, Olive Avenue to Bellevue Road ▪ Highway 59, new segment between Highways 99 and 140 ▪ Yosemite Avenue, extend from R Street to Highway 59 ▪ Yosemite Avenue, widen to 4 lanes, Campus Parkway to G Street ▪ Bellevue Road, widen to 6 lanes, Highway 59 to Campus Parkway ▪ R Street, extend from Yosemite Avenue to Bellevue Road ▪ Parsons Avenue/Gardner Avenue, extend and widen to 4 lanes, Childs Avenue to Bellevue Road ▪ Highway 59, new alignment along Mission Avenue ▪ Mission Avenue, widen to 4 lanes, Highway 99 to Highway 59 ▪ Childs Avenue, widen to 4 lanes, Campus Parkway to Highway 59 (b) For development through Year 2025, UCP development shall contribute its fair share towards the total cost of the regional improvements identified in this EIR as mitigation for significant project impacts, as listed below, as well as toward the Funded and Tier 1 improvements listed in the July 19, 2001, RTP for which existing and future funding from local, regional and State sources		

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
	Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
						falls short of the full project cost.- ▪ Yosemite Avenue, extend from R Street to Highway 59 ▪ Yosemite Avenue, widen to 4 lanes, Campus Parkway to G Street ▪ R Street, extend from Yosemite Avenue to Bellevue Road ▪ Parsons Avenue/Gardner Avenue, extend and widen to 4 lanes, Childs Avenue to Bellevue Road ▪ Bellevue Road, widen to 4 lanes, Highway 59 to Campus Parkway (c) For development through Year 2015, the County shall analyze the expected future operations of the Lake/Yosemite intersection at the following milestone points: (1) determination of the conceptual alignment for Campus Parkway, (2) preparation of the Geometric Approval Drawings for Campus Parkway, and (3) each October, beginning in the opening year of the UC Merced campus. If any of these analyses determine that the Lake/Yosemite intersection will operate at unacceptable LOS, the proposed UCP shall contribute its fair share toward the cost of any improvements deemed necessary at the intersection. Monitoring of the Lake/Yosemite intersection		

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

Impacts		Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation		Residual Significance	
		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015			Buildout	2015
								shall end upon completion of the Campus Parkway extension from Yosemite Avenue to Bellevue Road. (d) The County shall work with the City of Merced, Caltrans and MCAG to establish rights-of-way and access management requirements along the routes identified above.		
4.14-8	**The proposed UCP and the UC Merced campus, in combination with other development in Merced County, would increase congestion on local and regional roads.**	S	S	Policy T 1.1	S	S	4.14-8(a) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.14-7(a). In addition, UCP development shall contribute its fair share toward intersection improvements along G Street between Highway 99 and Childs Avenue. (b) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.14-7(d).		SU	SU
				4.15 Utilities						
4.15-1	**The proposed UCP would require the construction of substantial new and/or expanded water supply extraction, treatment and distribution facilities to meet anticipated demand.**	S	S	Policies IW 1.1, 1.3 through 1.7, 1.14, 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 10.1, 11.1, 11.2, 11.4, 11.7, 11.8, 13.1 through 13.4.	LS	LS	None required		LS	LS
4.15-2	**The proposed UCP could interrupt the flow of water from the UCP area to off-site users, which could affect the ability of those areas to irrigate agricultural properties.**	S	LS	Buildout: UCP Policies IW 4.5, 12.1 and 12.2 2015: None	LS	LS	None required		LS	LS
4.15-3	**The proposed UCP would increase**	S	S	Policies IW 1.8, 1.10,1.11, 1.12, 4.5, 8.5,	LS	LS	None required		LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

	Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
	the demand for wastewater treatment and disposal, which could require the construction of new facilities and potentially require expansion of existing local municipal wastewater treatment facilities.			10.1, 11.5 through 11.9 and 13.4					
4.15-4	**Development of the UCP would require construction and installation of new wastewater infrastructure.**	S	S	Policies IW 1.8, 1.9, 1.11, 1.12, 10.1 and 13.4	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.15-5	**The proposed UCP would generate biosolids, the disposal of which through land application may exceed the capacity of the current disposal site, and/or may exceed quality standards established by federal or State treatment standards.**	S	S	Policy IW 1.8	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.15-6	**Development of the UCP, in combination with the UC Merced campus and other development in the region, would increase the demand for wastewater treatment facilities.**	Merced WWTP: LS Atwater: S	Merced WWTP: LS	Policies IW 1.8, 1.9, 1.11,1.12, 8.5, 10.1, 11.6, 11.7, 11.8, and 13.4	Atwater: S	Atwater: S	None available	Merced: LS Atwater: SU	Merced: LS Atwater: SU
4.15-7	**The proposed UCP would generate solid waste.**	LS	LS	Policies ISW 1.1 through1.3, 2.1, through 2.7	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.15-8	**The proposed UCP, in combination with cumulative development would increase the amount of solid waste generated, and could exceed the permitted capacity of the Highway 59 Landfill.**	S	S	Policies ISW 1.1, 1.3, 2.1 through 2.7	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.15-9	**The proposed UCP would increase**	S	S	Policies IE 1.2, 1.4 through 1.6, 2.1, 3.1,	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 1 TO EXHIBIT A
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES AND SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

	Impacts	Significance		Mitigation included in the UCP	Significant after UCP		Additional Mitigation	Residual Significance	
		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015		Buildout	2015
	the demand for electricity and natural gas.			through 3.7, 4.1 through 4.7 and IW 6.1 through 6.5.					
4.15-10	**The proposed UCP would require the extension of electrical and natural gas transmission and distribution infrastructure.**	S	S	Policy IE 1.1 and 1.3	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
4.15-11	**The proposed UCP, in combination with other development in the region served by PG&E and/or MID, would increase the demand for electricity and natural gas.**	S	S	Policies IE 1.2, 1.4 through 1.6, 2.1, 3.1 through 3.7, and 4.1 through 4.7, and IW 6.1 through 6.5	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS
	6. Growth Inducement								
6-1	**Implementation of the UCP would accommodate growth induced by the UC Merced campus, and would not induce substantial economic and population growth in the region, and would not result in the construction of substantial amounts of additional housing. This growth is expected to result in less-than-significant environmental effects.**	LS	LS	Policies LU 2.9, and AA2.1 and 2.4	LS	LS	None required	LS	LS

LS = Less than Significant S = Significant PS = Potentially Significant NI = No Impact SU = Significant and Unavoidable