PUBLIC DRAFT INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
RESIDENCE INN – MACE RANCH PROJECT
4647 FERMI PLACE
Environmental Checklist and Initial Study for Mitigated Negative Declaration #2-16

Project Title: Residence Inn – Mace Ranch

Planning Application: PA #15-70: General Plan Amendment #4-15; Preliminary Planned Development/Rezone #8-15; Final Planned Development #11-15; Conditional Use Permit #8-15; Design Review #29-15; and Mitigated Negative Declaration #6-15

Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Davis
Department of Community Development and Sustainability
23 Russell Boulevard
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Contact Person and Phone Number: Katherine Hess, Community Development Administrator
(530) 757-5652

Project Location: 4647 Fermi Place, City of Davis
(APN #071-424-004)

Project Sponsor’s Name and Address: Eric Edelmayer
Jackson Properties
155 Cadillac Drive, Suite 100
Sacramento CA 95825

Project Background & Description:

Project Location
The Residence Inn – Mace Ranch (proposed project) is located in the City of Davis, in Yolo County, California, as shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Project Location
The project site is 2.69 acres located at 4647 Fermi Place, Davis, as shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Project Site

Existing Uses
The site is vacant. Vegetation on the site is composed of barren and ruderal habitat. There are no trees on the site. The site is regularly (at least annually) treated with herbicide to control vegetation growth. The Second Street and Fermi Place frontages have curb, gutter, and sidewalk. The site is flat.
Surrounding Land Use
The project neighborhood includes a mix of light industrial, retail, and multi-family uses along Second Street. The parcel to the immediate south is vacant. The Union Pacific Railroad Tracks and Interstate 80 (south of the vacant parcel) and the Mace Boulevard Overcrossing form the east and south boundaries of this corner of the Mace Ranch subdivision. Table 1 provides an overview of the existing uses, zoning, and land use designations for the project site as well as surrounding areas.

Table 1. Project Site and Surrounding Zoning and General Plan Land Use Designations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Site</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Gas station / Minimart and Vacant portion of University Covenant Church parcel</td>
<td>PD #4-88 for Light Industrial / Business Park uses</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Vacant parcel, Union Pacific Railroad, and Interstate 80</td>
<td>PD #4-88 for Office uses</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Mace Boulevard overcrossing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>Light Industrial and Retail businesses</td>
<td>PD #4-88 for Light Industrial / Business Park uses</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description
The applicant requests approval of planning entitlement applications to develop a 120-room extended stay hotel on the vacant 2.69 acre parcel located at 4647 Fermi Place with. The building will be four stories and approximately 49’ 4” in height. The building footprint will be approximately 22,838 square feet with a total building square footage of approximately 78,953 square feet.
In addition to guest rooms, the ground floor will include guest amenities and back of house staff operations, including the lobby/hearth room, lounge, fitness center, meeting business center, staff offices and breakroom, mechanical, electrical, laundry and maintenance facilities. The second through fourth floors will consist primarily of guestrooms with limited space dedicated to building systems and staff operations. The roof level will house building systems and solar panels. The exterior amenities consist of an outdoor common area, outdoor swimming pool, and sport court.

Vehicular access to the site will be provided by two new driveways from Fermi Place. The project will provide 121 vehicular surface parking spaces, including three accessible “H” spaces. Bicycle/pedestrian access will be provided through the driveways to Fermi Place, and through a connection to Second Street on the north edge of the site. There will be bicycle parking spaces in two areas: a secured area for employee bicycle parking; and a rack at the front of the building for guest and loaner bicycles.

The design of the Project will incorporate photovoltaics on carports, solar hot water, and energy-efficient appliances. As required by the City’s building ordinance, the Project will be required to incorporate CALGreen Tier 1 features, including the fifteen percent compliance margin for energy code. Landscaping will feature drought-tolerant and low maintenance species.

The proposed project will connect to existing water, sewer, storm drain, and dry utilities which are all stubbed to the site.

Standard City Conditions of approvals for water conservation; air quality and ozone precursor actions during construction; noise reduction practices; energy efficiency; tree preservation, planting and protection; and the City’s Green Building Ordinance would be imposed on the project will help reduce its environmental impacts.

In addition to standard City of Davis requirements, the Residence Inn – Mace Ranch Project will include the following sustainability components:

- High efficiency guestroom appliances, kitchen appliances, laundry appliances, boilers
- High efficiency public space HVAC
- High efficiency and occupancy controlled HVAC and lighting
- Solar hot water heating
- High performance envelope including high R value wall and ceiling assemblies and low albedo (cool) roof
- Window shading devices on high solar gain exposures
- Systems commission at building start-up
- Drought-tolerant landscaping
- Primarily drip irrigation with seasonal/weather control
- Water conserving faucets, showerheads, and toilet
- Laundry on demand
- LED Lighting – exterior, interior public spaces and guestrooms
- Lighting control system for public spaces and exterior
- Manage backlight, uplight, and glare per IES TM-15-11
- Bicycle loaner program
- Covered-secured bicycle storage
- Shuttle to provide transportation to airport, downtown Davis and UCD
- EV charging station, carpool/LEV dedicated parking
- Waste separation / recycling by housekeeping
- Public area waste containers / recycling containers
- Erosion control during construction
- Stormwater pretreatment swale and infiltration basin
- Construction waste reduction and recycling
- Burrowing owl mitigation to be completed by Mace Ranch

**Policy, Plan, and Zoning Consistency:** The City’s General Plan identifies the site for Office uses. The intent of the Office designation is to provide locations for small administrative, professional, and medical offices in centrally located areas near the downtown and/or residential neighborhoods. The site is zoned Preliminary Planned Development #4-88 for industrial research uses. The General Plan and Planned Development amendments adding hotels as a conditionally permitted use between Interstate 80 and 2nd Street and allowing the proposed height and Floor Area Ratio would bring the General Plan Land Use designation and zoning into consistency.

**Previous Relevant Environmental Analysis:** The project site has been included as part of the EIR prepared for the City’s 2001 General Plan Update (SCH #1999072014, certified June 6, 2000).

**Permits and Approvals Required for Project:** The following actions, permits and approvals are required for the proposed project:
1. General Plan Text Amendment to add hotels as a conditionally permitted use within the Office land use category, with a maximum Floor Area Ratio of 1.0;
2. P-D#4-88 District Amendment (Zoning Amendment) to add hotels as a conditionally permitted use within the a sub-area of the Industrial Research subarea of the Planned Development;
3. Final Planned Development to establish the development standards for the proposed structure;
4. Conditional use permit for the proposed hotel use;
5. Design Review to review the site plan and architecture; and
6. Mitigated Negative Declaration to evaluate the environmental impacts associated with the proposal.

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND IMPACTS**
This section describes the existing environmental conditions on and near the project site, as well as environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. The environmental checklist, as recommended in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, was used to identify environmental impacts that could occur if the proposed project is implemented. Mitigation measures are identified for all potentially significant project impacts.

The CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4 provide that mitigation may include:
1. Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.
2. Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.
3. Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment.
4. Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.
5. Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Land Use/Planning
- Population/Housing
- Transportation/Circulation
- Agricultural Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazards/Hazardous Materials
- Mineral/Energy Resources
- Public Services
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Air Quality
- Geology/Soils
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

Conclusions:
The project, as proposed, will not have a significant effect on the environment for the following reasons:

1. It will have only temporary or short-term construction impacts, such as dust and equipment emissions, noise and truck traffic.
2. It will not generate a significant amount of additional vehicles, noise or emission levels.
3. It will not affect rare or endangered species of animal or plant, or habitat of such species.
4. It will not eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or pre-history.
5. It will not result in a significant effect on air, water quality or ambient noise levels for adjoining areas.
6. It will not be subjected to unacceptable risk of flooding or major geological hazards.
7. It will not have a substantial aesthetic affect.
8. It will not breach any published national, state or local standards relating to solid waste.
9. It will not involve the possibility of contaminating public water supply or adversely affecting groundwater.
10. It will not result in or add to a violation of the wastewater discharge requirements applicable to local sewer systems as prescribed by California Regional Water Quality Control Board.
11. It will not occur to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.
12. It will not result in adverse cumulative impacts.
13. It will not result in adverse growth-inducing impacts.
14. It will not result in substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly.
15. It will not conflict with the City’s General or Specific Plans.
DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

____________________________

Katherine Hess, AICP
Printed Name

City of Davis Community Development & Sustainability

____________________________

September XX, 2016
EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. AESTHETICS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses a) and b): No Impact
The proposed project is located in a developed and urbanized area where there are no federal, state or locally designated scenic vistas. The site does contain any scenic resources such as heritage oak trees, rocks or historic buildings. The City of Davis General Plan Program EIR has determined that the Davis Planning Area has no officially designated scenic highways, corridors, vistas or viewing areas. Therefore, there is no impact.

Response c): Less Than Significant Impact
The Project would include construction of a four-story hotel building, surface parking lot and drive aisles, gathering areas, and customary hotel amenities on the vacant parcel. Vegetation on the site is barren and ruderal habitat. There are no site. The project would be subject to standard design review conditions regarding articulation of facades, building fenestration and lighting, signage, and construction materials. Views of the Project from the south are screened by the berms of the Mace Boulevard Overcrossings and the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. Although the project would constitute a change from the existing undeveloped condition, it is surrounded by development and the site does not contain any visually interesting qualities. It would not degrade the nature of the site or the area and impacts are less than significant.

Response d): Less Than Significant Impact
The Project would add parking lot and building lighting to a parcel that is primarily unlit, although there are street and building lights along Second Street and Fermi Place. The Project is in an area that is surrounded by existing industrial, office, apartments and roadways, where lighting, such as street lighting exists. In addition, any new lighting will comply with the City’s outdoor lighting control ordinance and standard conditions of approval and impacts are less than significant.
### II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Programs of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland zoned Timberland Production?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses a)-e): No Impact**

The project site is not currently used for agricultural operations, and has not been used for farming for decades. The project site has been previously graded and cleared. Construction of the proposed project will not disturb forest land or timber land, as defined in the Public Resources Code sections above. There is no land designated as Prime, Unique of Statewide Importance. There would be no impact resulting from changes in the existing environment that could lead to conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no conflict and there would be **no impact**.

### III. AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Initial Study – City of Davis*  
*Residence Inn – Mace Ranch Project (PA #15-70)*
III. AIR QUALITY

| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | □ | □ | ❌ | □ |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | □ | □ | ❌ | □ |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | □ | □ | ❌ | □ |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | □ | □ | ❌ | □ |

The analysis below is based on the Air Quality Impact Analysis – Residence Inn Project, Davis, prepared by LSA Associates, June 10, 2016. A copy of this report is included as Appendix A.

The project would release emissions over the short-term during project construction and over the long-term from project operation. Long-term operational emissions occur consistently over the life of the project. Operational emissions are generated by the project by stationary sources, area sources and mobile sources. The total amount of these sources of emissions makes up the operational impact of the proposed project. The project also has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to pollutant concentrations due to the project site’s proximity to the adjacent freeway.

All projects are subject to adopted Yolo Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) rules and regulations in effect at the time of construction. Specific rules applicable to the construction of the project may include but are not limited to the following:

**Rule 2.3- (Ringelmann Chart).** This rule prohibits stationary diesel-powered equipment from generating visible emissions that would exceed the rule’s visibility threshold.

**Rule 2.5-(Nuisance).** This rule prohibits any source from generating air contaminants or other materials that would that would cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to the public; endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of the public; or damage businesses or property.

**Rule 2.11- (Particulate Matter Concentration).** This rule prohibits any source that would emit dust, fumes, or total suspended particulate matter from generated emissions that would exceed the rule’s established emission concentration limit.

**Rule 2.14- (Architectural Coatings).** This rule establishes volatile organic compound (VOC) content limits for all architectural coatings supplied, sold, offered for sale, applied, solicited for application, or manufactured within YSAQMD’s jurisdiction.

**Rule 2.28- (Cutback and Emulsified Asphalts).** This rule establishes organic compound limits for cutback and emulsified asphalts manufactured, sold, mixed, stored, used, and applied within YSAQMD’s jurisdiction.
Rule 2.40- (Wood Burning Appliances). This rule prohibits installation of open hearth wood burning fireplaces in any new development (residential or commercial, single or multi-family units). New developments may only use either a pellet-fueled heater, a U.S. EPA Phase II certified wood burning heater or a gas fireplace.

Rule 2.37- (Natural Gas-Fired Water Heaters and Small Boilers). This rule establishes NOX emission limits for natural gas-fired water heaters with a rated heat input capacity less than 1,000,000 British Thermal Units per hour—(Btu/hour) manufactured, offered for sale, sold, or installed within YSAQMD’s jurisdiction.

Rule 3.1- (General Permit Requirements). This rules establishes permitting processes (i.e., Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate) to review new and modified sources of air pollution.

Rule 3.4- (New Source Review). This rule would require any new or modified stationary source that generates emissions that exceed established emissions limits for each pollutant (i.e., ROG, NOX, sulfur oxides [SOX], PM10, CO, and lead) to comply with Best Available Control Technology and emissions offset requirements.

Rule 3.13- (Toxics New Source Review). This rule requires the installation of best available control technology for toxics (T-BACT) at any constructed or reconstructed major source of TACs.

Response a)-b): Less Than Significant Impact

Air pollutant emissions associated with the project would occur over the short-term from construction activities, such as fugitive dust from site preparation and grading and emissions from equipment exhaust and architectural coatings.

The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) was used to estimate construction emissions for the proposed project; results of the model are shown in Table 2. Under this scenario, unmitigated project emissions would not exceed the Yolo-Solano AQMD’s significance threshold for criteria pollutants. Although the project does not exceed the significance criteria, the AQMD recommends implementation of best management practices to reduce dust emissions and avoid localized health impacts. Many of these recommendations are incorporated into City of Davis standard conditions of approval and applied to this Project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2: PROJECT CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reactive Organic Gases</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(tons/year)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo-Solano AQMD Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Long-term air emission impacts are those associated with stationary sources and mobile sources related to the proposed project. Stationary source emissions result from the consumption of natural gas and electricity. Mobile source emissions result from vehicle trips generated by the project, resulting in air pollutant emissions affecting the entire Sacramento Valley Air Basin. Regional emissions associated with project’s mobile sources were calculated using the CalEEMod model and the trip generation rates from the TIA. Appendix A to the Air Quality Impact Analysis contains model output worksheets.
The incremental daily emission increase associated with the project is identified in Table 3 for reactive organic gases (ROG) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) (two precursors of ozone) and coarse particulate matter (PM10). The Yolo-Solano AQMD has established thresholds of significance for ozone precursors (ROG and NOx) at 10 tons per year and fugitive dust of 80 pounds per day. As shown in Table 3, the emissions associated with the project would be well below the significance threshold and, therefore the project would not be considered significant. No mitigation would be required.

Table 3: Project Regional Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reactive Organic Gases (tons/year)</th>
<th>Nitrogen Oxides (tons/year)</th>
<th>PM10 (pounds/days)</th>
<th>PM2.5 (pounds/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Emissions</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo-Solano AQMD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance Threshold</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Because the proposed project would result in construction-related and operational emissions below the applicable thresholds of significance and would comply with applicable YSQAQMD rules, regulations, and best management practices for dust impacts would be less than significant.

Response c): Less Than Significant Impact
CEQA defines a cumulative impact as two or more individual effects, which when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. Air pollution is largely a cumulative impact and no single project is sufficient in size to itself result in nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. In developing the thresholds of significance for air pollutants used in the analysis above, the YSAQMD considered the emission levels for which a project’s individual emissions would be cumulatively considerable. Therefore, if a project exceeds the identified significance thresholds, its emissions would be cumulatively considerable, resulting in significant adverse air quality impacts to the region’s existing air quality conditions. If daily average or annual emissions of operational-related criteria air pollutants exceed any applicable threshold established by the YSAQMD, the proposed project would result in a cumulatively significant impact.

As shown in Table 3 above, implementation of the proposed project would generate regional emissions that do not exceed established thresholds. Therefore, the project would not make a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional air quality impacts and would represent a less than significant impact.

Response d): Less Than Significant Impact
Vehicular trips associated with the proposed project would contribute to the congestion at intersections and along roadway segments in the project vicinity. The primary mobile source pollutant of local concern is CO. Carbon monoxide concentration is a direct function of vehicle idling time and, thus, traffic flow conditions. Carbon monoxide disperses rapidly with distance from the source under normal meteorological conditions. However, under certain extreme meteorological conditions, CO concentrations proximate to a congested roadway or intersection may reach unhealthful levels, affecting local sensitive receptors. Typically, high CO concentrations are
associated with roadways or intersections operating at unacceptable levels of service or with extremely high traffic volumes.

A traffic impact analysis (TIA) for the proposed project was prepared by KD Anderson & Associates, Inc. (Appendix C). The traffic report indicates that implementation of the proposed project will maintain acceptable Levels of Service (LOS) at all study intersections and the project will add about 2 percent of peak hour traffic to the roadway. Based on the CO screening procedures outlined in the Yolo-Solano AQMD handbook, the project would not reduce the level of service to an unacceptable LOS (E or F) and would not worsen an already existing peak-hour LOS F on one or more streets or intersections. The proposed project is not expected to generate a CO hotspot at nearby roadways or intersection; therefore, changes in CO levels resulting from the proposed project would be less than significant.

The proposed project is not expected to be a source of Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs) that would result in significant air quality impacts. However, the proposed project would construct extended stay hotel rooms approximately 1,000 feet from I-80. The traffic on the freeway, as well as on local streets, includes both diesel-powered vehicles which emit diesel particulate and gasoline-powered vehicles which emit a number of TACs, all of which have been determined to pose cancer risks and may cause other health problems when exposed to the pollutants over the duration of a lifetime.

There are currently no federal project-level requirements for air toxics analysis, and CEQA only requires a consideration of the risks from toxics. The Yolo-Solano AQMD has a TAC threshold for development projects that have the potential to expose the public to TACs from stationary sources in excess of the thresholds established in the District’s Risk Management Policy. While the District’s Risk Management Policy provides a basis for a threshold for TACs from stationary sources, this policy does not cover TACs from mobile sources. Therefore, the project is not subject to a significance threshold for mobile source toxic emissions such as those from vehicle emissions from I-80. The District has no permitting or other regulatory authority over mobile sources, such as vehicle emissions. The project is not located within 500 feet of I-80; however, the following evaluation of risks associated with exposure to freeway emissions is provided for informational purposes.

California’s Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) has determined that long-term exposure to diesel exhaust particulates poses cancer risk. Health risk analyses determine cancer risk levels over a 70-year exposure duration. LSA previously conducted a health risk assessment for residential units located within 150 feet of I-80 in the project vicinity. That analysis showed that the increased 70-year cancer risk would be 16 in 1 million for future residents of the project site. The proposed project is an extended-stay hotel and the average resident stay would be approximately 5 days and could be up to 14 days. Based on LSA’s previous analysis findings, even if a guest of the hotel stayed for one year, the increased health risk would be well below 1 in 1 million. Therefore, the potential inhalation health risks from diesel exhaust at the project site would not be significant due to the relatively short exposure duration, especially given the nearly sevenfold distance increase compared to the previous analysis.

Based on the hotel visitor’s short duration of stay at the project site and due to the relatively low overall risk of exposure attributable to I-80, TAC emissions would not be considered a significant health risk. Future guests of the hotel would not be exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, health risks from exposure of sensitive receptors to localized concentrations of TACs would be less than significant.
Response e): Less Than Significant Impact

Heavy-duty equipment in the project area during construction would emit odors. However, the construction activity would be short-term and would cease to occur after project construction is completed. No other sources of objectionable odors have been identified for the proposed project. Therefore, the project would not be expected to generate or expose sensitive receptors to odors.

Furthermore, the project would be implemented in compliance with YSAQMD Rule 2.5, which states that “A person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public or which endanger the comfort, repose, health, or safety of any such persons or the public or which cause to have a natural tendency to cause injury or damage to business or property.” If odor complaints are received by the YSAQMD, the YSAQMD is required to investigate the complaint, as well as determine and ensure a solution for the source of the complaint, which could include operational modifications. Thus, although not anticipated, if odor complaints are made after the proposed project is developed, the YSAQMD would ensure that such odors are addressed and any potential odor effects reduced to less than significant.

Therefore, odor impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are recommended. This impact is considered less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☒

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☒
### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vegetation on the site is composed of barren and ruderal habitat. There are no trees on the site. The site is regularly (at least annually) treated with herbicide to control vegetation growth.

**Response a): Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation**

The western burrowing owl (a state Species of Special Concern and Federal Bird of Conservation Concern) is known to exist in the City of Davis, and a nesting pair are known to occupy the Project site. Burrowing owls are transient during the fall and winter months and additional owls could easily settle into the burrows onsite.

Suitable Swainson’s hawk nesting habitat may be present in nearby trees located within a one-quarter mile radius of the site. Construction related activity may cause disturbance to any active Swainson’s hawk nests located within ¼ mile of the project site. Mitigation would be required to reduce potential significant impacts to burrowing owl and Swainson’s hawk to a less than significant level.

The Fermi Place cul-de-sac is located on the southwest corner of Mace Blvd and Second Street. Approximately 11 acres of vacant land occurs along Fermi Place. The City of Davis General Plan Update EIR refers to the vacant land as the “Under Second Street” parcels with General Plan designations for office and light industrial.

The vegetation on the vacant land is maintained with a combination of herbicides and discing. Mace Blvd at the signalized intersection with Second Street/Road 32A is a busy, four lane road with left-turn pockets and right-turn movement lanes to and from Second Street on the west side of the intersection. Existing development around the intersection includes an AM/PM gas station, Ikeda’s Market, the Davis Park n Ride, apartments, and a business park.
Given the General Plan designation and zoning for the vacant land, no long-term protection for this active den location is likely. The CNDDB ranks this location as “D”, signifying a small and/or non-viable population, typically with degraded habitat that is usually not in good condition, and that is not expected to persist over five years.

The owls are at risk due to human disturbance and harassment. CNDDB notes an owl killed by a car at this location in 2005. The Davis Enterprise article from June 7, 2015, reports on two incidents of harassment in May. An employee at an adjacent business on Fermi Place reported that “someone had covered the burrowing owls’ holes with large rocks.” Another person said he had found “BB gun pellets, cigarette butts and beer cans surrounding the burrow… He notified the Davis Police Department.

A September 20, 2015 comment to a Davis Vanguard article reported seeing kids with dirt bikes and remote racing cars/trucks drive around on the vacant lands on weekends and holidays. The commenter noted that the activities damage the existing burrows and cause the owls to fly off.

The Project site contains multiple small mammal burrows that are suitable for burrowing owl nesting and cover. Suitable burrows also occur on vacant parcels to the north and south of the project site, as well as along the adjacent Mace Blvd. overcrossing and Union Pacific Railroad corridor. The site is not considered to be high-quality habitat due to its highly disturbed nature, proximity to high-traffic roads, and urban surroundings. Avoidance of the occupied burrowing owl burrow is not possible with the proposed development plans for the site.

CDFW’s Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW 2012) says CDFW is unable to authorize the capture and relocation of burrowing owls except within the context of scientific research (FGC §1002) or a NCCP conservation strategy.

Direct or indirect impacts to burrowing owl nests or individuals may occur as a result of construction, and would be considered potentially significant. The following mitigation would be necessary to reduce potential direct and indirect impacts to burrowing owl habitat to a less than significant level.

**BIO-1. Burrowing Owl Surveys and Passive Exclusion**

- For active burrowing owl burrows on-site or within specified buffer distances, the following seasonal restrictions and buffer distances shall be implemented:
  - During the non-breeding season (1 September through 31 January), the biologist shall establish a 160 ft environmental sensitive area (ESA) around the burrow.
  - During the breeding season (1 February through 31 August), the biologist shall establish a 250 ft ESA around the burrow in consultation with CDFW. Based on the existing level of disturbance on site and the close proximity of existing transportation, retail, commercial, and residential land uses a 250 buffer is sufficient to protect active burrowing owl burrows.
  - The size of the ESA may be reduced if the biologist monitors the construction activities and determines that no disturbance to the burrowing owl is occurring. Reduction of
ESA size depends on the location of the burrow relative to the project, project activities during the time the burrow is active, and other project-specific factors.

- If the burrow is located within the construction zone and it is during the non-breeding season, the burrowing owl can be passively excluded from the burrow using one-way doors, as described in the Exclusion Plan of Appendix E of the Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW 2012).

- If the burrow is located within the construction zone and it is during the breeding season, the burrow owl can only be passively excluded if it has been confirmed by a qualified burrowing owl biologist that the owl has not begun egg laying and incubation, clutch was unsuccessful, or juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival.

- A Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan will be prepared and implemented in accordance with Appendix E of the 2012 Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation (CDFW 2012). Plan implementation will only occur after CDFW approval of the Plan.

- The Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan will require site monitoring prior to, during, and after exclusion of burrowing owls from their burrows sufficient to ensure take is avoided. The Applicant will conduct daily monitoring for a minimum of one week to confirm the young of the year have fledged if the exclusion will occur immediately after the end of the breeding season.

- Prior to the implementation of the approved burrow exclusion plan, the project biologist shall coordinate with CDFW and offer the owls to be included in any current applicable study, if the study is able to exclude the owls in 2017. Should CDFW decline the inclusion of these owls in that study, the developer will implement a monitoring program, via a qualified burrowing owl biologist, as described in the CDFW approved Project Burrowing Owl Exclusion Plan.

- A summary monitoring report shall be submitted to the City of Davis and CDFW upon conclusion of monitoring.

- The developer may choose to work with burrowing owl researchers to translocate any owls found on the Project property, in-lieu of exclusion, as long as such translocation is approved by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife with the appropriate permits. Translocation of burrowing owls would be completed prior to any soil disturbance or construction activity on the site.

**BIO- 2. Burrowing Owl Habitat Mitigation**

- Prior to implementing passive exclusion, translocation, or issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall mitigate for the loss of burrowing owl nesting habitat in the amount of six (6) acres. Mitigation lands shall be of greater quality than the existing site with the same or greater number of suitable nest burrows and occupied by nesting burrowing owls.

- Mitigation acres may be acquired at a CDFW approved burrowing owl mitigation or conservation bank or permanently protect private lands that provide suitable nesting burrowing owl habitat. Use of private lands for burrowing owl mitigation will require recordation of a conservation easement, a burrowing owl habitat management plan, and establishment of an approved endowment to fund for the perpetual management activities. The applicant may use the permanent protection of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat and/or
the purchase of Swainson’s hawk foraging credits to satisfy this requirement, provided CDFW verifies that those lands and proposed uses are suitable for burrowing owl.

Literature Cited
California Department of Fish and Game (DFG). 7 March 2012. Staff report on burrowing owl mitigation. California Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, CA.

Swainson’s Hawk Nesting/Foraging Habitat
The site is relatively small and does not currently support an adequate prey base to support Swainson’s hawk foraging. The site has no trees and is affected by noise from the railroad tracks and Interstate 80. As such, the site is not considered suitable nesting or foraging habitat. There are no known active or historic Swainson’s hawk nesting sites within one-quarter (1/4) mile of the project site. However, there are suitable nest trees in the vicinity of the site (associated with nearby parks, greenbelts, the freeway corridor, and private property). It is possible that Swainson’s hawks may establish nests in one of the suitable trees near-by between now and future development. Direct or indirect impacts to Swainson’s hawk nesting may occur as a result of construction, and would therefore be considered potentially significant. The following mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce impacts to less than significant.

BIO-3. Disturbance to Swainson’s Hawk Nesting
1. Construction should be timed to begin outside of the hawk’s breeding season (February 1 thru August 31, annually).
2. If construction must be scheduled to begin during the nesting season, a Swainson’s hawk nest survey shall be conducted within ¼ mile of the site, no sooner than two weeks prior to the start of construction activity.
3. Construction may be delayed or require formal Department of Fish and Wildlife consultation should active nests be present within ¼ mile during the pre-construction surveys.

Compliance with these mitigation measures will ensure that the impact to burrowing owls and Swainson’s hawk is less than significant.

Response b): No Impact
The site is of barren and ruderal habitat. The proposed project does not adversely affect any locally designated species, natural communities, wetland habitats, or migration corridors. The proposed project is considered to have no impact.

Response c): No Impact
There are no wetlands, or water bodies within the proposed project site. Therefore, the project will have no impact relative to this issue.

Response d): No Impact
There are no wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites on the site. It is not adjacent to any corridors or nursery sites. The proposed project is considered to have no impact.

Response e): No Impact
There are no trees on the site, and construction is not anticipated to affect any trees. Trees will be planted on the site, as required by City of Davis standard conditions of approval and requirements for parking lot shading. The proposed project is considered to have **no impact**.

**Response f): No Impact**
The Yolo Natural Heritage Program is a Habitat Conservation Program being developed to conserve natural open space and agricultural landscapes and habitats for special status species. Because the project site is not considered natural open space and agricultural landscapes, the project will have **no impact** on this program.

---

### V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses a)-c): No Impact**
The proposed project will not impact any known historic or cultural resources. No religious resources are associated with the project site that would be impacted. The area has been previously graded and is not considered a sensitive cultural site. Standard conditions will apply in the event that archaeological, paleontological, or historical resources are discovered during excavation or grading. There are **no impacts** that can be identified with the proposed project.

**Response d): Less Than Significant Impact**
The area has been previously graded and standard conditions will apply in the event that archaeological, paleontological, or historical resources are discovered during excavation or grading. With the standard condition of approval, impacts are **less than significant**.
## VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation
- [x] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation
- [x] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation
- [x] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

iv. Landslides?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation
- [x] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

### b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation
- [x] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

### c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation
- [x] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

### d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation
- [x] Less Than Significant Impact
- [ ] No Impact

### e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- [ ] Potentially Significant Impact
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation
- [ ] Less Than Significant Impact
- [x] No Impact

### Responses a)-d): Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project would not increase the exposure to identified geologic hazards. No known earthquake fault lines are located within the City or its planning area. There are a number of fault zones located within 100 miles of the city, but the City of Davis is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone as identified by the California Geological Survey (see...
The Office of Planning and Research has placed the Davis area in Seismic Activity Intensity Zone II, which indicates that the maximum intensity of an earthquake would be VII or VIII on the Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale. An earthquake of such magnitude would result in slight damage in specially designed structures; considerable in ordinary substantial buildings, with partial collapse; great in poorly built structures.” The Uniform Building Code places all of California in the zone of greatest earthquake severity because recent studies indicate high potential for severe ground shaking.

There will always be a potential for ground shaking caused by seismic activity anywhere in California, including the project site. In order to minimize potential damage to the buildings and site improvements, all construction in California is required to be designed in accordance with the latest seismic design standards of the California Building Code. City standard conditions of approval will require the proposed project to provide and comply with a site-specific soils report prior to construction and be appropriately designed to meet all earthquake standards as required by Building Codes. Any impacts are considered less than significant.

Response e): No Impact
The proposed project will connect to the existing city sewer system and there would be no on-site septic systems. Therefore, no impact would occur related to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an adopted plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis below is based on the Air Quality Impact Analysis – Residence Inn Project, Davis, prepared by LSA Associates, June 10, 2016. A copy of this report is included in Appendix A.

Greenhouse gases are present in the atmosphere naturally, are released by natural sources, or are formed from secondary reactions taking place in the atmosphere. The gases that are widely seen as the principal contributors to human-induced global climate change are: Carbon dioxide (CO2); Methane (CH4); Nitrous oxide (N2O); Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs); Perfluorocarbons (PFCs); and Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF6).

Over the last 200 years, humans have caused substantial quantities of greenhouse gases to be released into the atmosphere. These emissions are increasing greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere and enhancing the natural greenhouse effect, which is believed to be causing global warming. While
manmade greenhouse gases include naturally-occurring greenhouse gases such as CO2, methane, and N2O, some gases, like HFCs, PFCs, and SF6 are completely new to the atmosphere.

The proposed project would generate direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions contributing to global warming and climate change. Although the contribution from an individual project may be minor, the cumulative impact can be substantial. Although the YSAQMD has not established thresholds for greenhouse gas emissions, CEQA still requires an evaluation of greenhouse gases.

The California Global Warming Solution Action of 2006 (Assembly Bill 32) was adopted establishing a state goal of reduction of California’s greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020. A subsequent Executive Order signed by the Governor establishes an additional target for State agencies of 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. The City of Davis has adopted local greenhouse gas emission reduction targets that are consistent with the State targets outlined in AB 32 and Executive Order S-3-06. The emission reduction targets require that projects make a fair share contribution to meet local and statewide reduction targets. This conclusion was based on the understanding that projects built today are expected to be in existence past the 2050 target date that calls for a minimum reduction of CO2 to 80 percent below 1990 levels.

The 2010 City of Davis Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (D-CAAP) includes local reduction targets for greenhouse gas emissions for new development projects. By 2050, the City’s CO2 target is 80 percent below 1990 levels. The D-CAAP includes a number of actions under different sector categories for implementation in order to begin achieving the emission reduction goals. The plan incorporates energy conservation in its community design of the buildings. The proposed project advocates uses that are consistent with the land use and community design requirements, by including a very high level of energy efficiency in the project design. Nevertheless, implementation of the project would result in short-term construction and long-term operational greenhouse gas emissions.

Response a): Less Than Significant Impact
Construction activities would generate greenhouse gas emissions during construction work on-site as well as from the transportation of material between the construction site and staging areas. Based on the results of the CalEEMod analysis, the project would generate approximately 366 tons of CO2e emissions. These potential impacts would be limited to duration of construction activities and greenhouse gas generation would halt once the project is completed. Therefore, construction emissions would be less than significant.

Long-term operation of the proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions from mobile sources and indirect emissions from sources associated with energy consumption. Mobile-source emissions of greenhouse gases would include project-generated vehicle trips associated with future guests of the hotel as well as hotel employee trips. Emissions would also be generated at off-site utility providers as a result of demand for electricity generated by the proposed project.

The project would include measures to reduce energy consumption, including the following:
- LED lighting and lighting control system;
- High-efficiency guestroom, kitchen, and laundry appliances;
- High efficiency HVAC and boilers;
- Solar hot water heating;
- High-performance envelope including high R value and ceiling assemblies and low albedo roof;
- Window shading devices on high solar gain exposures;
- Photovoltaic electricity generation as part of parking lot shading;
- Alternative transportation options; and
- Material resource efficiency.

These measures would greatly reduce the energy consumption and subsequent greenhouse gas emissions associated with the project.

Table 4 shows the CalEEMod results for estimated GHG emissions for the proposed project. The analysis includes reductions for energy efficiency and also accounts for the installation of a 75 kW PV system. Mobile source emissions are the largest source of GHG emissions at approximately 74 percent of the total. Energy use is the next largest category at approximately 22 percent of the total. Waste and water source emissions are approximately 3 percent and 1 percent of the total, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Metric Tons Per Year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emissions Source Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Emissions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Column totals may vary slightly due to independent rounding of input data.


The YSAQMD has not adopted CEQA thresholds of significance for greenhouse gas emissions. Stationary emitters of greenhouse gas emissions are required to report greenhouse gas emissions of 25,000 metric tons per year CO₂e or above, and several air districts in California (Bay Area Air Quality Management District, South Coast AQMD) have adopted a CEQA significance threshold of 10,000 metric tons of CO₂e per year for stationary sources. The BAAQMD also adopted a threshold of 1,100 metric tons per year CO₂e for development projects. Although the project is not a stationary source of greenhouse gas emissions, but primarily a mobile source, it is still useful to compare the project estimated emissions to these greenhouse gas emission thresholds to provide context for the magnitude of emissions. The project estimated emissions of 959.3 metric tons per year are substantially lower than the 10,000 metric tons per year threshold adopted by other air districts in California, and is also lower than the 1,100 metric tons threshold established by the BAAQMD. Therefore project estimated emissions of greenhouse gases would not be considered substantial.

Additionally, because the proposed project’s net increase in operational greenhouse gases would not be substantial with respect to mass emission thresholds that have been recommended by other air
districts for analyzing stationary sources, and because the proposed project would have increased energy efficiency over standard building methods, the project would be consistent with the goals mandated by AB 32. Greenhouse gas emissions associated with the proposed project would not be cumulatively considerable. Therefore impacts from greenhouse gas emissions would be considered less than significant.

Response b): Less Than Significant Impact

The project would include energy-reducing measures that are consistent with the intent of the D-CAAP. Bus routes are located near the proposed project, including one directly across Mace Boulevard, less than 100 feet east of the proposed project, and two others located approximately 540 feet north and 800 feet southwest, respectively. The project would also provide bicycles, bicycle parking, and bicycle repair for hotel guests to use, as well as electric vehicle charging stations, carpool/low emission vehicle dedicated parking, and a hotel shuttle to provide transportation to the airport, downtown Davis, and UC Davis. Water reduction measures include water conserving toilets, sinks, and showers, laundry on demand (reduced towel/sheet replacement) and drought-tolerant landscaping with primarily drip irrigation and seasonal/weather control of irrigation. Therefore, the sustainability measures included in the proposed project plans would be consistent with the D-CAAP and would not conflict with the reduction goals established by AB 32. As a result, the project would not conflict with plans adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and impacts are less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
<td>❑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response a)-b): Less Than Significant Impact**

Hazardous materials encompass a wide range of substances, some of which are naturally-occurring and some of which are man-made. Examples include pesticides, herbicides, petroleum products, metals (e.g., lead, mercury, arsenic), asbestos, and chemical compounds used in manufacturing and other uses. Determining if such substances are present on or near project sites is important because exposure to hazardous materials above regulatory thresholds can result in adverse health effects on humans, as well as harm to plant and wildlife ecology.

Construction of the project will require minimal use of petroleum based products (oil, gas, diesel fuel) and a variety of chemicals including solvents, cleaners and paints. However, the quantity and frequency of these will not rise to the level of significant environmental impacts. The project is a hotel development that would typically use household hazardous materials, which would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, the project will have **less than significant** impact.

**Response c): No Impact**

As discussed above, the project is a hotel development that would typically use household hazardous materials, which would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. The nearest school (Frances Harper Junior High School) is nearly a half-mile to the northwest. Therefore, the project will have **no impact**.
Response d)-f): No Impacts
There are no existing structures on the project site. The site is not on the list of hazardous material sites complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (Cortese List). The closest airport is located over two miles from the project site. The project site is not located within an airport influence area or near a private airstrip and development of the site for hotel use would not result in a substantial safety hazard for people residing or working at the project site and there would be no impact.

Construction of the proposed project would not impair or interfere with the implementation of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan because the site has adequate access. Therefore, there would be no impact.

Response g)-h): Less Than Significant Impact
The project site is located in a developed residential area and fronts on a major arterial street. There are no wildlands adjacent to the project site. In the event of a fire, hotel guests and employees could evacuate to safer areas quickly. The proposed project would include fire sprinklers and alarms in compliance with building and fire codes. Application of standard building and fire codes will result in a less than significant impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Source:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses a) and f): Less Than Significant Impact
Top soil may be exposed temporarily during grading, which may cause wind and water erosion to discharge sediment or pollutants into storm water runoff and thereby affect water quality. However, the project will require an approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that includes Best Management Practices for grading and erosion control. Additionally, prior to approval of a building permit or improvement plans, the applicant will be required to submit an Erosion Control Plan to the Director of Public Works for review and approval. The Plan must detail the BMPs that will be implemented to prevent the discharge of storm water pollutants.

The project site currently has no impervious surfaces. Construction of the project would result in more than one acre of new impervious surface area, including the building footprint (22,875 sf), pool and outdoor gathering areas, and parking/drive areas (total 54,404 sf pavement). The impervious
surfaces associated with driveways parking lots and buildings will include the use of automotive petroleum products, household hazardous materials and other pollutants that can drain directly to the storm drain system and ultimately into the creeks. The proposed project will be subject to the requirements of the City of Davis Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance. The ordinance requires projects meet development standards of the State of California’s Phase II Small MS4 General Permit, 2013-0001-DWQ, dated February 5, 2013. To meet the requirements, the project design shall:

- incorporate permanent storm water treatment control measures and site design measures to retain, evaporate, infiltrate and transpirate pollutants in storm water runoff; and
- include mechanisms that post-project runoff shall not exceed estimated pre-project flow rate for the 2-year, 24-hour storm.

Compliance with the above regulatory requirements will ensure that the project impact is less than significant.

**Response b): Less Than Significant Impact**

The project’s water demands will be met by the City of Davis existing potable water supply system. The proposed project will connect to City’s water system that draws from groundwater and surface water supplies. The proposed project will be required to comply with standard water conservation measures for appliances and irrigation. Development on the site was assumed in the build-out calculations for the City’s Urban Water Management Plan. The additional water demand will not cause ground water levels in the City’s aquifers to decline. Therefore, the project will result in a less than significant impact with respect to depleting groundwater supplies.

**Responses c)- e): Less Than Significant Impact**

No stream or water courses traverse the project site and the project would not change the course of a stream or river. The current site runoff is absorbed on site and any runoff from the site flows onto the adjacent streets to existing storm drain inlets and the City of Davis storm drain system. Preliminary grading and drainage plans show runoff from the project will be collected via bio-retention planters to the storm drain system. Altering the site runoff or adding additional runoff to a system that has inadequate capacity could have a significant impact if it causes downstream flooding or drainage issues. A detailed engineered drainage plan will be required at the time of the building permit submittal. The City will require the applicant to demonstrate project runoff will be maintained in its natural path and that there is adequate capacity in the storm drain system to accommodate the increase in runoff.

In order to comply with storm water infiltration standards, the project includes bio-retention facilities sized to meet City and State requirements. These will be designed to serve as water quality treatment facilities as well as flow control facilities. Prior to receiving a grading or building permit, the applicant will be required to provide detailed calculations to ensure that drainage facilities are sized to handle runoff from the site and meet city and state requirements for water quality treatment. These will be included as standard conditions of project approval. Therefore, the project will not substantially the drainage pattern of the site or the area in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site or cause flooding and the impact is less than significant.

**Responses g)- i): No Impact**

Based on the most recent FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps, the project site is outside the 100-year floodplain and not within a flood hazard area. Implementation of the project will not expose people
or structures to significant flood hazards. There are no dams in the area of the project site, nor are there bodies of water large enough near the project site that will affect the site in the event of a seiche or tsunami. Therefore, there is no impact from flooding, tsunami or mudflow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Response a): No impact
The proposed project will implement existing City General Plan policy which seeks to encourage infill development and discourage urban sprawl. The project site is a vacant parcel in an area that has been identified for urban development since 1987. Development of the site will not physically divide an established community. The use has been planned as part of an orderly, logical development that supports compatibility among adjacent uses.

Response b): Less Than Significant Impact
The proposed project’s land use designation and zoning would be in conflict with the existing General Plan “Office” designation and PD #4-88, Industrial Research zoning. The project applicants are requesting a General Plan Amendment and rezoning to add hotels as conditionally permitted uses within the designation and the planned development, and to increase the allowable Floor Area Ratio. The Project supports General Plan Goal ED 2 to “Attract visitors to Davis.” The proposed project is compatible with the adjacent commercial and residential uses to the east and south. The GPA and Rezoning/Planned Development will make the proposed uses consistent with the General Plan and zoning for the site and the impact is less than significant.

Response c): No Impact
The Yolo Habitat Conservancy is a Joint Powers Agency in the process of preparing a plan for conserving agricultural lands and open space/habitats for special status species in Yolo County. The plan has not been adopted and will not be affected by the development of this infill parcel. Therefore, the project will have no impact on conflicting with an adopted habitat conservation plan.
### XI. MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response a)-b): No Impact**

The project site was previously disturbed and is in an area that does not contain any known or designated mineral resources. Implementation of the proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of any known mineral resource. The City’s *General Plan* does not identify any mineral resources in the vicinity of the project site or within the city itself. Therefore, the project will have **no impact** on the loss or availability of mineral resources to the region.

### XII. NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### XII. NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis below is based on the Environmental Noise Assessment for the Residence Inn Hotel at 2nd and Mace prepared by Bollard Acoustical Consultants, June 6, 2016. A copy of this report is included in Appendix A.

A noise impact study was required by the City of Davis due to the proximity of the project site to several major noise sources including traffic on Interstate 80 and train activity on the nearby rail line. Road traffic on Interstate 80 is the existing major noise source impacting the project.

**Response a): Less Than Significant with Mitigation**

The Noise Element of the City of Davis General Plan establishes a 60 dB Ldn exterior noise level criterion as normally acceptable for outdoor activity areas of new transient lodging uses affected by transportation noise sources. This standard is typically applied at common recreation areas (e.g., pool, spa). The City also establishes an interior noise level criterion of 45 dB Ldn for new transient lodging construction. The intent of this interior noise level limit is to provide a suitable environment for indoor communication and sleep.

To generally quantify the exiting ambient noise environment in the project vicinity, Bollard Acoustical Consultants conducted short-term and long-term noise level measurements at the project site. Typical daytime noise levels averaged 55 dB Leq and that the computed Ldn was 59 dB. Measured maximum noise levels at the project site ranged from 62 to 75 dB Lmax. The long term measurement results indicate that the existing noise exposure at the project site is acceptable relative to the City’s 60 dB Ldn noise standard for new transient lodging facilities, and that the ambient noise levels did not vary dramatically between the hours of 6 am and 9 pm. The measured maximum noise levels at the project site were caused by local traffic on Mace Boulevard and 2nd street, and railroad operations do not contribute significantly to the ambient noise environment at the project site. Noise level measured 25 feet above ground were found to be 6 dB higher than measured ground floor noise measurements.
Given this range of exterior noise levels, building façade noise reductions ranging from 16-25 dB would be required to ensure compliance with the City of Davis 45 dB Ldn interior noise standard. Standard hotel construction (exterior stucco siding, insulated walls, dual-pane thermal windows STC 27-28) typically provides a minimum 25 dB of exterior to interior noise reduction. As a result, interior noise levels within the proposed hotel are not predicted to exceed the City of Davis standard.

Additionally, interior noise levels are predicted to comply with the City of Davis interior standard with standard construction practices. Nonetheless, the following mitigation measure is recommended to provide an additional margin of safety relative to the City’s 45 dB Ldn interior noise level standard:

1. **Interior Noise Levels Exceeding City of Davis Standards**

   All 3rd and 4th-floor guestroom windows with a view of Interstate 80 be upgraded to an STC rating of 32.

The above analyses show that impacts of the proposed project will be **less than significant with mitigation.**

**Response b): Less Than Significant Impact**

Activities such as grading, utilities placement, and building and parking lot construction have the potential to generate low levels of ground-borne vibration through the use of construction equipment. Sometimes this vibration can damage nearby structures. Construction of the project would not require pile driving or blasting, which are generally the sources of the most severe vibration. Typically, the equipment used for this type of project would not create vibration. During operation, activities on the site will include vehicle movement, HVAC equipment for the building, and other activities typical of small-scale urban development. These activities are not expected to be the source of vibration. Therefore, the impact will be **less than significant** and no mitigation would be required.

**Response c): Less Than Significant Impact**

Noise-generating activities at an extended-stay hotel such as vehicle engines and doors closing, emergency generators, air conditioners, landscape maintenance equipment, and outdoor recreational activities have the potential of generating noise. The vacant site does not currently have noise-generating uses. However, the site is in an urban area adjacent to the railroad tracks and Interstate 80, and ambient noise levels are higher than many areas of Davis. In addition, uses on the site will be subject to the City’s noise regulations, which prohibits unnecessary, excessive and annoying sound levels from all sources. Given the existing noise environment, and the City regulations, impacts to ambient noise levels will be **less than significant.**

**Response d): Less Than Significant Impact**

Construction-related noise would result in a short-term increase in noise levels beyond those identified for a residential district in the City’s General Plan Noise Element. There are no existing sources of noise that exceed City standards that have been identified within the site, or in the surrounding areas. The proposed project will be subject to the requirements of the City of Davis Municipal Code Section 24.02.040 (Noise Ordinance) with respect to limits of construction, which allow construction to occur during the hours of 7 a.m.to 7 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 8 a.m. through 8 p.m. Saturdays and Sundays. Therefore, compliance with the City’s Noise Ordinance would ensure construction noise would be **less than significant.**
Responses e) and f): No Impact
The nearest airport to the site is the University Airport, located over two miles west of the project site. Aircraft operations would not expose future residents to excessive aircraft noise. The project is not located with an airport land use plan; therefore, no impact would occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X. POPULATION AND HOUSING</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, especially affordable housing and necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response a): Less Than Significant Impact
The project site is located in a developed area of the City where public utilities and services (sewer, water, storm drainage) are available to accommodate the demands of the project. Approval of the project will not require extension of new infrastructure to areas not currently served by existing services. Therefore, the project will not either directly or indirectly induce new population growth.

The project will provide employment opportunities. The June 2016 labor force data for Yolo County shows an unemployment rate of 5.9 percent, with 6,200 unemployed persons (see http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/file/lfm/month/countyur-400c.pdf). The Project can help provide employment opportunities for existing Yolo County residents who are seeking work. Therefore, the proposed project will have a less-than-significant impact on population growth.

Response b)-c): No Impact
The site is currently vacant and construction of the proposed project would not displace residents or housing. Therefore, there would be no impact.
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- Fire protection? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- Police protection? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐
- Schools? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
- Parks? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Response a): Less Than Significant Impact or No Impact
Due to the size of the project and its infill location, the project will not require the construction of new facilities or require physically altering existing facilities to maintain the City’s public services.

Fire protection is provided by the City of Davis Fire Department. The closest fire station is located slightly over a mile from the project site. Hotels, as with any use that brings people, has the potential to increase demand for emergency services, including fire and ambulance. However, no additional fire personnel or equipment would be required to serve the hotel. The proposed project would be served by existing fire resources.

Police protection services for the project site are provided by the City of Davis Police Department, which has a station located at 2600 Fifth Street. The project’s increase in demand for police protection would be adequately served by City of Davis Police Department. No additional police personnel, equipment, or expanded facilities would be required.

Budget and staffing for public safety service is evaluated and addressed annually on a city-wide level by the Davis City Council. The City adopts an annual budget allocating resources to police and fire protection services, which effectively establishes the service ratio for that particular year. The annual budget is based on community needs and available resources as determined by the City Council.
The hotel project is not anticipated to generate children who will attend schools provided by the Davis Joint Unified School District (DJUSD). Nevertheless, the project is within Davis Joint Unified School District Community Facilities District #2, which provides ongoing assessments to mitigate impacts of new development on school facilities. California Government Code Section 65996 indicates payment of the fees fully mitigates the impacts of new development on school services. Therefore, there would be no impact to school services.

The City of Davis has more than 30 parks and recreation facilities, which include a combination of mini parks, neighborhood parks, community parks, the golf course, Central Park and two playing field facilities. Existing open space resources consist of wildlife habitat areas in the County, neighborhood greenbelts, drainage ponds and channels in the City, and various open spaces on the UC Davis campus. The site is proximate to John Barovetto Park, which connects to the bicycle path connection to Mace Ranch District Park and the Dave Pelz overpass connection to the South Davis greenway system. The proposed project will not include residential uses or be subject to the City’s General Plan standard of 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 population. However, the project will contribute park improvement impact fees as a requirement of development, which can be used for park improvements elsewhere in Davis.

Therefore, project impacts related to fire and police services, schools and parks would be less than significant or no impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XV. RECREATION</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the project:

a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

Response a): Less Than Significant Impact
The proposed project would have negligible impacts on the demand on parks and other recreational facilities in the City because it would not create a new residential population. It is anticipated that employees and guests of the hotel would not cause substantial deterioration to existing parks or recreational facilities caused by the project. The project will also provide on-site pool and gathering area areas, thus further reducing the impacts on existing recreational facilities. Consequently, the project’s impacts on recreation will be less than significant.
Response b): Less Than Significant Impact  
The project includes recreational facilities typical of an extended-stay hotel, such as a swimming pool, sport court, and gathering areas. Impacts are addressed as part of the overall project within this Initial Study, and are less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system including, but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in any change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following analysis and conclusions are based on a Traffic Impact Analysis for Residence Inn Project prepared by KD Anderson & Associates, Inc., dated July 21, 2016. A copy of this report is included in Appendix C.

Response a), b): Less Than Significant Impact
Construction activities would generate temporary traffic through delivery of construction equipment to the site, the daily arrival and departure of construction workers, and the delivery of materials throughout the construction period. The number of daily construction trips is temporary and expected to be within the range of daily trips anticipated for the long term residential use. Therefore, based on the traffic analysis, construction traffic trips are not considered a significant impact.

The proposed project is expected to generate 872 daily trips with 70 a.m. and 74 p.m. peak hour trips. After accounting for bicycle and public transit the project is expected to generate 829 new daily motor vehicle trips, with 66 new a.m. trips and 70 new p.m. trips. The distribution of project traffic was determined based on knowledge of the project area, existing hotels within Davis and existing and future travel patterns in the area.

Levels of Service were evaluated for seven intersections in the area of the proposed project. The analysis considered both a.m. and p.m. traffic. The existing intersections operate at acceptable Levels of Service, at LOS D or better. Existing Plus Project Specific Impacts. The existing intersection operating Levels of Service will be maintained with the addition of project traffic. All locations will operate at LOS E or better. Therefore, impacts to inconsistency with adopted policy and level of service standards will be less than significant.

Response c): No Impact
The proposed project will not require any changes to existing regional air traffic activity. The nearest airport, University Airport, is a private airstrip located over 2 miles west of the project site. The project does not include any components that would affect air traffic, rail or water-related facilities. Therefore, there is no impact.

Response d): No Impact
The proposed project design does not include any unusual traffic or safety hazards. Vehicular circulation and emergency access were found to be adequate by the City’s Fire, Public Works and Police Departments. The proposed project will use the existing bike and pedestrian path along Second Street and will not create hazards or barriers for pedestrians and bicyclists. Therefore, there is no impact from hazards.

Response e): No Impact
Fire protection and emergency medical response are provided by the City of Davis Fire Department. The closest fire station is located approximately one-half mile from the project site, to the south at the intersection of Cowell and Mace Boulevards. The proposed project would be served by existing fire resources and would have no impact on emergency access from the fire station or along Mace Boulevard. Therefore, there is no impact.

Response f): No Impact
There are existing bike paths and lanes within the area, including bicycle lanes on Second Street and a bicycle path connecting the Second Street Crossing (Target) shopping center and Barovetto Park to light industrial and tech businesses in east Davis, as well as the Dave Pelz overcrossing to South Davis. The Project includes loaner bicycles for hotel guests, along with parking for hotel and guest
bicycles. The proposed project will provide access to existing bus routes located on Second Street and Mace Boulevard and would not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation. Therefore, there are **no impacts**.

### XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response a)-g): Less Than Significant Impact**

Due to the relative size and nature of the proposed project, impacts to local and regional water supplies, storm drainage, and waste water facilities are expected to be less than significant. Water and sewer are stubbed to the site for easy connection. The developer will be required to work with utility service providers prior to the issuance of building permits and occupancy to ensure
infrastructure to the site is adequate to serve the project. There is ample capacity and the landfill to absorb solid waste from the project. The proposed project will not have a significant impact on utilities or services in that new systems or substantial alterations are not anticipated to be required. Impacts are considered to be less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response a): Less than Significant with Mitigation.** As discussed above, there are no structures on the site and the site has been previously disturbed so the discovery of archaeological material is not likely. Impacts to wildlife species are mitigated through measures such as pre-construction surveys and burrowing owl habitat mitigation. In addition, although unlikely, the possibility exists for subsurface excavation of the site during grading and other construction activities to unearth deposits of cultural significance. However, this IS/MND reflects standard conditions of approval that would reduce any potential impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, the proposed project would have less than significant impacts related to degradation of the quality of the environment, reduction of habitat, threatened species, and/or California's history or prehistory.
**Response b): Less than Significant.** The proposed project in conjunction with other development within the City of Davis could incrementally contribute to cumulative impacts in the area. However, the project's incremental contribution towards cumulative impacts would not be considered significant. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any impacts that would be cumulatively considerable, and impacts would be less than significant.

**Response c): Less than Significant.** The proposed project site is surrounded by existing development, and is an infill project. Due to the consistency of the proposed land use with the surrounding uses, substantial adverse effects on human beings are not anticipated with implementation of the proposed project. During construction activities, the project could result in temporary noise increases. However, this IS/MND includes mitigation measures that would reduce any potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. In addition, the proposed project would be designed in accordance with all applicable building standards and codes to ensure adequate safety is provided for the future residents of the proposed project. Therefore, impacts related to environmental effects that could cause adverse effects on human beings would be less than significant.
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