

1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE AND INTENDED USES OF THIS EIR

The 3820 Chiles Road Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) as amended. The City of Davis is the lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed project evaluated herein and has the principal responsibility for approving the project. As required by Section 15121 of the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR will (a) inform public agency decision-makers, and the public generally, of the significant environmental effects of the project, (b) identify possible ways to minimize the significant adverse environmental effects, and (c) describe reasonable and feasible project alternatives which reduce environmental effects. The public agency shall consider the information in the EIR along with other information that may be presented to the agency in deciding whether to approve the application.

As provided in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15021, public agencies are charged with the duty to avoid or minimize environmental damage where feasible. The public agency has an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social issues. CEQA requires the preparation of an EIR prior to approving any project that may have a significant effect on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, the term *project* refers to the whole of an action, which has the potential for resulting in a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15378[a]). With respect to the proposed project, the City has determined that the proposed development is a *project* within the definition of CEQA, which has the potential for resulting in significant environmental effects. The basic requirements for an EIR include discussions of the environmental setting, environmental impacts, mitigation measures, alternatives, growth inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts.

1.2 PROPOSED PROJECT

This section provides an overview of the project location and components. For additional project description details, please refer to Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR.

Project Location

The 7.4-acre project site is located at the southeast corner of Chiles Road and La Vida Way in the City of Davis, California, within the South Davis Specific Plan Area. Regional access to the site is provided by Interstate 80 (I-80) and the I-80/Mace Boulevard interchange, located northeast of the project site. The site is identified by Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 069-070-022.

Currently, the infill project site is developed with a two-story 53,248-square foot (sf) office building (built in 1966) and associated site improvements, including two surface parking lots located to the north and east of the building, respectively. Approximately 118 trees are located at the site entry way, along the building perimeter, and throughout the parking lots. The remainder of the project site is primarily dominated by weedy, ruderal vegetation. An approximately 12-foot-high soil berm surrounds the existing building and extends along the northern side of the parking lot located to the east of the building.

The project site is bordered by La Vida Way to the west, a preschool (Merryhill Preschool) and multi-family residential development (Edge Apartments) to the south, a hotel (Days Inn) to the east, and Chiles Road to the north. One-story, single-family homes are located to the west of the site across La Vida Way. I-80 is located approximately 50 feet north of, and parallel to, Chiles Road along the project frontage.

Project Components

The proposed project would include demolition of the existing on-site building and parking lots to construct a residential development. Currently, the project includes two development scenarios. The Preferred Site Plan would include development of the site with multi-family rental units only, while Alternative B would include single-family homes along La Vida Way, at the western portion of the site, and multi-family units throughout the remainder of the site in a similar configuration as the Preferred Site Plan.

General Plan Land Use Amendment

The Preferred Site Plan would require an amendment to the City's General Plan Land Use Map to re-designate the project site from General Commercial to Residential High Density (RHD), which permits residential uses at a density of 25.00 to 50.00 dwelling units per gross acre (du/ac). The Preferred Site Plan would develop the site at a density of 31.3 du/ac (net) and 30.4 du/ac (gross).

Alternative B would require an amendment to the General Plan Land Use Map to redesignate the site from General Commercial to RHD for the multi-family component of the project and Residential Medium Density (RMD) for the single-family component. Alternative B would develop the multi-family portion at a density of 29.94 du/ac (net) and 29.38 du/ac (gross), while the single-family portion of the site would be developed at a density of 5.0 du/ac. The proposed land use changes are shown in Figures 3-5 and 3-6 in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR.

South Davis Specific Plan Text Amendment

The Preferred Site Plan would require an amendment to the South Davis Specific Plan to designate the site as Residential High Density (see Figure 3-7 in the Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR). Alternative B would re-designate the eastern, multi-family portion of the site as Residential High Density, while the western, single-family portion of the site would be re-designated Residential Medium Density (see Figure 3-8 in the Chapter 3, Project Description,

of this EIR). The required Specific Plan amendments would clarify the site's land use in the South Davis Specific Plan and ensure consistency with the proposed General Plan Amendment.

Rezone

The Preferred Site Plan would require a rezone to change the project site's zoning designation from Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) to a Planned Development (PD 2-17) (see Figure 3-9 in the Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR). Alternative B would require a rezone to change the zoning designation from CMU to PD 2-17 (Multi-Family Subarea) for the multi-family component of the project (6.4 acres) and PD 2-17 (Single-Family Subarea) for the single-family component (one acre) (see Figure 3-10 in the Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR).

Proposed Buildings and Site Layout

The Preferred Site Plan would include a total of three multi-family residential buildings clustered near the center of the project site. The easternmost building would include four stories, with heights stepping down to three stories for the remaining two buildings to the west. While the building heights have not been finalized, the four-story building is anticipated to be less than 48 feet and the three-story buildings would be less than 38 feet. The Preferred Site Plan would include three courtyard areas, a tot lot play area, a pool, and bike/pedestrian access providing a central amenity corridor between the buildings. A total of 225 rental units would be provided, including 16 micro studios (430 sf), 90 one-bedroom units (735 sf), 102 two-bedroom units (1,080 sf), and 17 three-bedroom units (1,250 sf). Overall, the Preferred Site Plan would include a total of 361 bedrooms. The southernmost building would include three-story walk up apartments with tuck-under garages, bike storage, and a kitchen/lounge. The first floor of the eastern building would include a fitness center, a leasing office, and a clubhouse area adjacent to the pool.

A linear green buffer would be located along the La Vida Way frontage with opportunities for shared uses between existing surrounding neighborhood residents as well as the future residents of the proposed multi-family development. The approximately 40- to 70-foot-wide open space area is anticipated to include a dog exercise area, a shade structure, seating areas, vegetated swales, and various landscaping elements, including new shade trees. Combined with the on-site circulation system, the open space area would provide an approximately 200-foot-wide buffer between the existing single-family residences on the west side of La Vida Way and the proposed multi-family units. The exterior façade of the northernmost on-site building would be located approximately 200 feet south of the nearest I-80 freeway travel lane.

Alternative B would include a total of approximately 188 apartment units, including 12 micro studios, 76 one-bedroom units, 88 two-bedroom units, and 12 three-bedroom units, resulting in a total of 300 bedrooms. In addition, the western portion of the site fronting La Vida Way would include five detached, two-story, single-family homes ranging from 2,000 to 2,300 sf. The single-family homes would front onto a proposed alley to the east of the buildings. Sole access to the alley would be provided by a new driveway connecting to La Vida Way. Alternative B would include a pool and courtyard area at the center of the site, with a clubhouse located to the north of the pool. The pool/courtyard area would be encircled by the proposed multi-family buildings.

Table 1-1 below provides a summary of the unit mix and number of bedrooms that would be included in each of the two development scenarios.

Table 1-1 Proposed Unit Mix		
Unit Type	Number of Units	
	Preferred Site Plan Alternative	Alternative B
Studio	15	12
One-Bedroom	90	76
Two-Bedroom	102	88
Three-Bedroom	17	12
Single-Family	0	5
Total Units	225	193

1.3 PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH SACOG’S 2036 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN/SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY (I.E., ELIGIBILITY FOR CEQA STREAMLINING)

The Legislature has adopted several statutory provisions to incentivize infill development within this region of the state that is consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) adopted by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) including but not limited to Public Resources Code sections 21155-21155.4, 21159.28, and 21099. SACOG has provided letters to the City of Davis (see Appendix A) indicating that both the Preferred Site Plan and Alternative B are consistent with SACOG’s MTP/SCS. Streamlining benefits applicable to qualifying in-fill projects that are consistent with SACOG’s MTP/SCS include the following:

1. The EIR is not required to reference, describe, or discuss (1) growth inducing impacts, or (2) any project specific or cumulative impacts from cars and light-duty truck trips generated by the project on global warming or the regional transportation network. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21159.28, subd. (a).)
2. Alternative locations, densities, and building intensities to the proposed project need not be considered. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21159.28, subd. (b) and 21155.2, subd. (c)(2).)
3. Aesthetic and parking impacts should not be considered significant impacts on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21099, subd. (d)(1).)

Per the letter provided by SACOG, the project site is located within a Transit Priority Area. Transit Priority Areas are areas of the region within one-half mile of a major transit stop or an existing or planned high-quality transit corridor included in the MTP/SCS. The project is entirely within one-half mile of the Cowell Boulevard high quality transit corridor in the MTP/SCS. In addition, the site is located within a half mile of Drummond Avenue to the west and Mace Boulevard to the east, both of which are considered high quality transit corridors in the MTP/SCS. Furthermore, the proposed project is an infill project within the Established Community designation of the MTP/SCS for the City of Davis. Within the Established Community, the MTP/SCS forecasts a range of low to high density residential, commercial,

office, and industrial uses. The project's land uses fall within the aforementioned range of general uses, densities, and building intensities. Therefore, development at the proposed densities is consistent with the buildout assumptions for the area within the Established Community area of the MTP/SCS. Based on the above, the City intends to streamline the 3820 Chiles Road EIR pursuant to PRC 21159.28. Further discussion of CEQA streamlining provisions as they relate to the analysis carried out in this EIR is provided in Chapter 4.0, Introduction to Analysis, of this EIR.

1.4 EIR PROCESS

The EIR process begins with the decision by the lead agency to prepare an EIR, either during a preliminary review of a project or at the conclusion of an Initial Study. Once the decision is made to prepare an EIR, the lead agency sends a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to appropriate government agencies and, when required, to the State Clearinghouse (SCH) in the Office of Planning and Research (OPR), which will ensure that responsible and trustee State agencies reply within the required time. The SCH assigns an identification number to the project, which then becomes the identification number for all subsequent environmental documents on the project. Commenting agencies have 30 days to respond to the NOP and provide information regarding alternatives and mitigation measures they wish to have explored in the Draft EIR and to provide notification regarding whether the agency will be a responsible agency or a trustee agency for the project. A NOP (see Appendix B), as well as a detailed Initial Study (see Appendix C), was prepared for the proposed project and was circulated from February 1, 2018 to March 5, 2018. A public scoping meeting was held on February 22, 2018 for the purpose of informing the public and receiving comments on the scope of the environmental analysis to be prepared for the proposed project. See Section 1.6 below for a summary of comments received on the NOP.

As soon as the Draft EIR is completed, a notice of completion will be filed with the SCH and a public notice of availability (incorporated herein) will be published to inform interested parties that a Draft EIR is available for agency and public review. In addition, the notice provides information regarding the location of copies of the Draft EIR available for public review and any public meetings or hearings that are scheduled. The Draft EIR will be circulated for a period of 45 days, during which time reviewers may make comments. The lead agency must respond to comments in writing, describing the disposition of any significant environmental issues raised and explaining in detail the reasons for not accepting any specific comments concerning major environmental issues. During the Draft EIR public review period or afterwards as soon as possible, a public meeting will be held before the Planning Commission and other relevant City commissions in order to receive verbal comments on the Draft EIR. If significant new information, as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5, is added to an EIR after public notice of availability is given but before certification of the EIR, the revised EIR or affected chapters must be recirculated for an additional public review period with related comments and responses.

A Final EIR will be prepared, containing comments and responses to comments on the Draft EIR. The Final EIR will also include any changes to the Draft EIR text made as a result of public comment. Before approving a project, the lead agency shall certify that the Final EIR has been

completed in compliance with CEQA, and that the Final EIR has been presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency, which has reviewed and considered the EIR. The lead agency shall also certify that the Final EIR reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis.

The findings prepared by the lead agency must be based on substantial evidence in the administrative record and must include an explanation that bridges the gap between evidence in the record and the conclusions required by CEQA. If the decision-making body elects to proceed with a project that would have unavoidable significant impacts, then a Statement of Overriding Considerations explaining the decision to balance the benefits of the project against unavoidable environmental impacts must be prepared.

1.5 SCOPE OF THE EIR

This EIR constitutes a project-level analysis for the 3820 Chiles Road Project and, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15161, covers "all phases of the project including planning, construction, and operation." State CEQA Guidelines § 15126.2(a) states, in pertinent part:

An EIR shall identify and focus on the significant environmental effects of the proposed project. In assessing the impact of a proposed project on the environment, the lead agency should normally limit its examination to changes in the existing physical conditions in the affected area as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is published, or where no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced.

Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, the scope of this EIR addresses specific issues and concerns identified as potentially significant in the Initial Study prepared for the proposed project.

Environmental Issues Dismissed in the Initial Study

The Initial Study prepared for the proposed project during the scoping period (see Appendix C) includes a detailed environmental checklist addressing a range of technical environmental issues. For each technical environmental issue, the Initial Study identifies the level of impact for the proposed project. The Initial Study identifies the environmental effects as either "no impact," "less-than-significant," "less-than-significant with mitigation incorporated," or "potentially significant." Impacts identified for the proposed project in the Initial Study as "no impact," "less-than-significant," or "less-than-significant with mitigation incorporated" are summarized below and discussed further in Appendix C. All remaining issues identified in the Initial Study as "potentially significant" are discussed in the subsequent technical chapters of this EIR.

- *Aesthetics (All Items)*: According to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) map of designated and eligible scenic routes under the California Scenic Highway Program, officially-designated State Scenic Highways are not located in the vicinity of the project site and, thus, development of the proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway, and *no impact* would occur. In addition, The City of Davis, according to the City of Davis General Plan Program EIR, has determined that the Planning Area of the General Plan does not contain

officially designated scenic highways, corridors, vistas, or viewing areas. The proposed project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

The proposed project is located in an area identified as a Transit Priority Area by the MTP/SCS and would be considered an urban infill project. Aesthetic impacts of infill projects within Transit Priority Areas are not considered significant effects on the physical environment (California Public Resources Code Section 21099[d]). With respect to light and glare, the proposed project would be required to comply with the City's Outdoor Lighting Control policies and the goals and policies of the General Plan. Accordingly, the proposed project would not introduce new sources of substantial light or glare to the site which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Based on the above, impacts related to such would be considered *less than significant*.

- *Agriculture and Forest Resources (All Items)*: The proposed project site is currently built-out with commercial uses and is identified as "Urban and Built-Up Land" in the Yolo County Important Farmland 2014 map. As such, development of the proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use. In addition, buildout of the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract, and Forest lands are not located within the project area, nor does the project site contain any portions zoned for forest land or Timberland Production. As such, *no impact* would occur related to agriculture and forest resources as a result of the proposed project.
- *Air Quality (e)*: Residential land uses, such as the proposed project, are not typically associated with the creation of substantial objectionable odors. As a result, the proposed project operations would not create any objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. Additionally, no facilities are located within the vicinity of the project site that would be expected to produce objectionable odors and therefore the new residential uses would not be exposed to objectionable odors. Diesel fumes from construction equipment are often found to be objectionable; however, construction is temporary and construction equipment would operate intermittently throughout the course of a day, would be restricted to daytime hours per Chapter 24 of the City's Municipal Code, and would likely only occur over portions of the improvement area at a time. Project construction would also be required to comply with all applicable YSAQMD rules and regulations, particularly associated with permitting of air pollutant sources. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people, and a *less-than-significant* impact related to objectionable odors would result.
- *Biological Resources (All Items)*: According to the Wetland and Biological Resources Assessment conducted for the project site by Barnett Environmental in February of 2017, the site does not contain wetland features and would not result in the disturbance of any such features. As a result, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS. In addition, the

project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a federally protected wetland, as defined by Section 404 of the CWA. Therefore, *no impact* would occur.

The site does not contain any existing waterways that would provide habitat for native resident or migratory fish. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites, and a *less-than-significant* impact would occur.

The proposed project could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; however, implementation of Mitigation Measures IV-1(a), IV-1(b), IV-2(a), IV-2(b), IV-3, and IV-4 set forth in the Initial Study would ensure any impacts would be *less than significant*. Specifically, the mitigation measures would require pre-construction surveys for Swainson's hawk, burrowing owl, raptors and nesting migratory birds, and special-status bats. Avoidance and minimization measures are provided in the event that any of the aforementioned species are detected during the surveys. Mitigation Measures IV-1(a), IV-1(b), IV-2(a), IV-2(b), IV-3, and IV-4 are included in Section 2, Executive Summary, of this EIR.

Development of the proposed project would require the removal of a substantial portion of the existing on-site trees, including trees protected by the City's Municipal Code; however, Mitigation Measure IV-5 would ensure impacts related to a potential conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance, would be *less than significant*. Specifically, Mitigation Measure IV-5 requires the implementation of tree preservation measures prior to and during construction for all trees to be preserved on the project site. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure IV-6 from the Initial Study would ensure that the mitigation/conservation requirements from the recently adopted Yolo Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP) would be adhered to prior to and during construction of the proposed project, as applicable. Given compliance with Mitigation Measure IV-6, impacts related to a potential conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, would be *less than significant*. Mitigation Measures IV-5 and IV-6 are included in Section 2, Executive Summary, of this EIR.

- *Cultural Resources (b,c,d)*: Due to the disturbed nature of the site and the surrounding area, the discovery of underlying archeological, paleontological, and/or tribal resources is not expected. However, given the prehistoric and historic activity that has occurred over time in the project area, unknown archaeological resources, including human bone, have the potential to be uncovered during ground-disturbing construction activities at the proposed project site. However, Mitigation Measures V-1, V-2, and V-3 set forth in the Initial Study would ensure that impacts related to such would be *less than significant*.

Specifically, Mitigation Measure V-1 would require standard protective procedures to be implemented in the event that subsurface historic remains, prehistoric or historic artifacts, other indications of archaeological resources, or cultural and/or tribal resources are found during grading and construction activities. Such procedures involve stopping work within 100 feet of the find(s), evaluation of the find(s) by a qualified archaeologist, and determination of appropriate mitigation methods. Mitigation Measures V-2 and V-3 similarly provide protective procedures related to unanticipated discovery of vertebrate bones/teeth and human remains, respectively. Such mitigation measures are summarized in Section 2, Executive Summary, of this EIR.

- *Geology and Soils (All Items)*: Damage to structures and risks to people from ground rupture and ground failure would be highly unlikely at the project site, and all project structures would be required to adhere to the provisions of the adopted edition of the California Building Code (CBC). The CBC contains provisions to safeguard against major structural failures or loss of life caused by earthquakes or other geologic and geomorphological hazards. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions, changes in geologic substructures, or geologic and geomorphological (i.e. avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards. In addition, the project site could potentially contain expansive soils. However, the General Plan states that buildout of the City's planning area, including the proposed project site, would have a less-than-significant impact given compliance with applicable General Plan policies, compliance with the CBC, and implementation of standard development practices.

Furthermore, the project site is currently developed with a commercial building. During stages of construction, and prior to overlaying the ground surface with structures, the potential exists for wind erosion to occur, which could affect the project area and potentially inadvertently transport eroded soils to downstream drainage facilities. However, in accordance with NPDES regulations, in order to minimize the potential effects of construction runoff on receiving water quality, any construction activity affecting one acre or more must obtain a General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit. Permit applicants are required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and implement BMPs to reduce construction effects on receiving water quality by implementing erosion control measures. Impacts related to the above are considered *less than significant*. Lastly, the proposed project would connect to the City's existing sewer system and would not require the use of a septic tank or other alternative waste water disposal method. Therefore, *no impact* would occur related to having soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternate wastewater disposal systems.

- *Hazards and Hazardous Materials (All Items)*: Although a limited amount of potentially hazardous materials could be used on-site during construction and operations, regulations governing the use of such materials and amount anticipated to be used on site would ensure the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of such materials would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, including through upset or accident conditions. The nearest school relative to the proposed project site is the Merryhill

Preschool, located adjacent to the site's southern boundary. As discussed above, the proposed residential development would not involve the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials. In addition, the proposed project does not involve any operations or changes to the existing roadway network that would impair implementation or physically interfere with the City's Multi-Hazard Functional Planning Guide or the County's Emergency Operations Plan or Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan (MHMP). Construction activities affecting any of the identified evacuation routes would be both temporary and subject to traffic controls. Impacts related to the above are considered *less than significant*. Per the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prepared for the project site, the site is not located on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip, and is not in an area subject to a substantial risk due to wildland fires. Thus, *no impact* and/or a *less-than-significant* impact related to hazards associated with such would occur.

Given that the site is currently developed with an existing structure, which was built in 1966, the Initial Study determined that development of the proposed project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment, particularly associated with Asbestos-Containing Materials (ACM) and Lead-Based Paint (LBP). However, Mitigation Measures VIII-1 and VIII-2 set forth in the Initial Study would ensure that impacts related to the aforementioned would be *less than significant*. Mitigation Measures VIII-1 and VII-2 require completion of site assessments prior to issuance of a demolition permit to determine whether the existing on-site structure contains ACM or LBP; and if the site assessment results are positive, the hazardous materials shall be remediated. Such mitigation measures are summarized in Section 2, Executive Summary, of this EIR.

- *Hydrology and Water Quality (g-j)*: Based on the Yolo County Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), development of the proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard zone nor place structures within a 100-year floodplain that would impede or redirect flood flows, and restrictions on development or special requirements associated with flooding are not required for the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam, and *no impact* would occur. In addition, because the City of Davis is not located near waters subject to tidal changes, closed bodies of water, or hilly or mountainous terrain, *no impact* related to seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows would occur.
- *Land Use and Planning (a,c)*: The project would be considered in-fill development and would not physically divide an established community. Thus, a *less-than-significant* impact would occur. The City recently adopted the Yolo HCP/NCCP. Implementation of Mitigation Measure IV-5 from the Initial Study, as required by Mitigation Measure X-1

of the Land Use section of the Checklist, would ensure that all applicable mitigation/conservation requirements from the HCP/NCCP would be adhered to prior to and during construction. Thus, impacts related to a potential conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan would be *less than significant*. Mitigation Measure X-1 is summarized in Section 2, Executive Summary, of this EIR.

- *Mineral Resources (All Items)*: A survey of aggregate resources by the State Division of Mines and Geology showed that significant deposits of aggregate resources are not located in the City of Davis Planning Area. The only mineral resource known to exist in the City of Davis Planning Area is natural gas, and specific resource areas for such have not been identified within the vicinity of the proposed project site. Due to the lack of mineral resources in the Planning Area, *no impact* related to mineral resources would occur.
- *Noise (e-f)*: The UC Davis Airport, located approximately 4.5 miles west of the project site, is the only airport in the immediate vicinity of Davis. The airport is used almost exclusively for flight training and for infrequent, short-duration operations. According to the City's General Plan Update EIR, impacts to noise-sensitive uses do not occur related to the UC Davis Airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not be exposed to excessive air traffic noise, and *no impact* would occur.
- *Population and Housing (All Items)*: As discussed previously, the Legislature has adopted several statutory provisions to incentivize infill development within this region of the State for projects that are consistent with the MTP/SCS adopted by SACOG. Specifically, Public Resources Code sections 21159.28, subdivision (a) provides that for qualifying residential infill projects growth inducing impacts are not required to be referenced, described, or discussed in the EIR. SACOG has provided letters to the City of Davis for the Preferred Site Plan and Alternative B as an appendix to the Initial Study, indicating that the proposed project is consistent with SACOG's MTP/SCS. As such, the project qualifies for streamlining benefits, and a discussion of potential impacts related to population growth are not required. Therefore, the proposed project would have a *less-than-significant* impact related to inducing substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly. The proposed project would not displace existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Furthermore, the project would add between 193 and 225 residential units to the City's housing stock. Thus, *no impact* would occur.
- *Public Services (All Items)*: The proposed project site is located within the service area of the Davis Fire Department. The nearest fire station relative to the project site is Station 33, located approximately 0.5-mile east of the site at 425 Mace Boulevard. As noted in the Initial Study, the proposed project would be located within a five-minute response time area for the Davis Fire Department, which is consistent with the City's response time goal. In addition, the project applicant would incorporate fire protection features in building design and pay impact fees for fire protection services. It should be noted that while the Davis Fire Department does not have a ladder truck capable of reaching the

upper floors of the proposed residential buildings, UC Davis' ladder truck would be capable of navigating to the site by way of Richards Boulevard. without significant delay or hindrance. Furthermore, the Davis Police Department located 2.3 miles west of the project site would be capable of providing adequate police protection services to the proposed project. The proposed project would be designed in compliance with Article 8.14, Minimum Security Building Standards, and the proposed project would include payment of the applicable Development Impact Fees.

The project includes residential development and, thus, could increase the number of students attending local school facilities. However, under the provisions of SB 50, a project's impacts on school facilities are fully mitigated via the payment of the requisite new school construction fees established pursuant to Government Code Section 65995. Furthermore, the proposed project would include on-site recreational amenities, and would be required to pay all applicable fees to the City related to recreational facilities. Thus, the proposed project would not substantially contribute to the need to alter existing parks or construct new parks within the City. Based on the above, impacts related to such would be considered *less than significant*.

- *Recreation (All Items)*: The proposed project would not substantially increase demand for parks or facilities and would not affect any recreational opportunities. The proposed project would include on-site recreational amenities and would be required to pay all applicable fees to the City related to recreational facilities. Therefore, a *less-than-significant* impact related to recreation would occur.
- *Transportation and Circulation (c)*: The proposed project does not include air travel. In addition, the proposed project would not be located near, or affect in any way, air traffic patterns at the UC Davis airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in air traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks, and *no impact* would occur.
- *Tribal Cultural Resources (All Items)*: The potential for unrecorded Tribal Cultural Resources to exist within the project site is relatively low based on existing environmental conditions; and Tribal Cultural Resources have not been identified within the vicinity of the project site. In compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 52 (Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1), a project notification letter was distributed to the Ione Band of Miwok Indians and the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation on August 9, 2017. Requests for consultation from either tribe were not received prior to the closure of the mandatory 30-day response period for consultation under AB 52. Nevertheless, the possibility exists that future development occurring on the proposed project site could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resources if previously cultural resources are uncovered during grading or other ground-disturbing activities. However, Mitigation Measure XVII from the Initial Study, which implements Initial Study Mitigation Measures V-1, V-2, and V-3, would ensure impacts related to Tribal Cultural Resources would be *less than significant*. As noted previously, Mitigation Measure V-1 would require standard protective procedures to be implemented in the event that subsurface prehistoric artifacts, other indications of archaeological resources,

or cultural and/or tribal resources are found during grading and construction activities. Mitigation Measures V-2 and V-3 provide similar procedures related to unanticipated discovery of vertebrate bones/teeth and human remains, respectively. Such mitigation measures are summarized in Chapter 2, Executive Summary, of this EIR.

Environmental Issues Addressed in this EIR

The sections of the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G Checklist identified for study in this EIR include the following:

- Air Quality;
- Cultural Resources;
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy;
- Hydrology and Water Quality;
- Land Use and Planning;
- Noise;
- Transportation and Circulation; and
- Utilities and Service Systems.

The evaluation of effects is presented on a resource-by-resource basis in Sections 4.1 through 4.8. Each section is divided into the following four sections: Introduction, Existing Environmental Setting, Regulatory Context, and Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

1.6 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE NOP

The City of Davis received four comment letters during the open comment period on the NOP for the 3820 Chiles Road Project EIR. A copy of each letter is provided in this EIR (see Appendix D). The following letters were authored by public agencies and residents.

Public Agencies

- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Native American Heritage Commission

Residents, Groups, and Organizations

- D. Elaine Ginosar
- Tim Kellen

The following list, categorized by issue, summarizes the concerns addressed in the comment letters:

<u>Cultural Resources</u> (Section 4.2)	Concerns related to the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts to cultural, historical, or tribal resources.
<u>Hydrology and Water Quality</u> (Section 4.4)	Concerns related to the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance with Water Quality Control Board policies and permitting requirements.
<u>Transportation and Circulation</u> (Section 4.7)	Concerns related to the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased traffic as a result of proposed project. • Increased traffic at Chiles Road and I -80 intersections.
<u>Initial Study</u> (see Appendix C)	Concerns related to the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nearby Frontier Fertilizer site. • Open space. • Parking.

All of the above issues are addressed in this EIR, in the relevant sections identified in the first column.

1.7 ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR

The 3820 Chiles Road Project EIR is organized into the following sections:

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Provides an introduction and overview describing the intended use of the EIR and the review and certification process, as well as summaries of the chapters included in the EIR and summaries of the environmental resources that would be impacted by the project.

Chapter 2 – Executive Summary

Summarizes the elements of the project and the environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project, describes proposed mitigation measures and indicates the level of significance of impacts after mitigation. Acknowledges alternatives that would reduce or avoid significant impacts.

Chapter 3 – Project Description

Provides a detailed description of the proposed project, including the location, background information, major objectives, and technical characteristics.

Chapter 4 – Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation

Contains a project-level and cumulative analysis of environmental issue areas associated with the proposed project. The section for each environmental issue contains an introduction and description of the setting of the project site, identifies impacts and recommends appropriate mitigation measures.

Chapter 5 – Statutorily Required Sections

Provides discussions required by CEQA regarding impacts that would result from the proposed project, including a summary of potential growth-inducing impacts, significant irreversible changes to the environment, energy conservation, and significant and unavoidable impacts.

Chapter 6 – Alternatives Analysis

Provides a comparative analysis of the alternatives to the proposed project, their respective comparative environmental effects, and a determination of the environmentally superior alternative.

Chapter 7 – EIR Authors and Persons Consulted

Lists report authors and persons consulted who provided technical assistance in the preparation and review of the EIR.

Chapter 8 – References

Provides bibliographic information for all references and resources cited.

Appendices

Includes the NOP, NOP comment letters received, and additional technical information.