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Project Background & Description:

Project Location
The Hyatt House Hotel project (proposed project) is located in the City of Davis, in Yolo County, California. The project site is 2.031 acres located at 2750 Cowell Boulevard, Davis, as shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Project Site
Existing Uses
The site is vacant. There are two valley oak trees on the site: one with three trunks having diameters of six, six, and five inches at 4.5 feet height; and one with a seven-inch diameter at 4.5 feet height. A broken (and in one area, charred) low wooden fence is on the south property line. The Cowell Boulevard frontage has curb, gutter, and sidewalk. The site is flat.

Surrounding Land Use
The project neighborhood includes a mix of office, light industrial, and multi-family uses along Cowell Boulevard, and single- and multifamily residents uses to the south. 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>Cowell Boulevard and Interstate 80, and Light Industrial and Service Commercial</td>
<td>PD 2-99B and #4-88 (across Interstate 80)</td>
<td>General Commercial and Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Greenbelt and Single-family Residential</td>
<td>Greenbelt, R-1-8 and PD R-2</td>
<td>Residential Low Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Bicycle path and Davis Diamonds Gymnasium</td>
<td>PD #2-12</td>
<td>Business Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>PD #12-87, Commercial Service Subarea</td>
<td>General Commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description
The applicant requests approval of planning entitlement applications to the vacant 2.013 acre parcel located at 2750 Cowell Boulevard with a 120-room extended stay hotel. The building will be four stories and approximately 47’ 10” in height (to the parapet), while the tower feature will be approximately 55’ in height. The building footprint will be approximately 20,452 square feet with a total building square footage of approximately 75,490 square feet. Total square footage will be approximately 76,460 square feet with the inclusion of an approximate 970 square foot outdoor gathering space.
In addition to guest rooms, the ground floor will include guest amenities and back of house staff operations, including the lobby, host stand, kitchen, lounge bar, fitness center, gathering room, 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 and an outdoor swimming pool. The average length of stay for guests is expected to be approximately 6-14 days with an average occupancy rate target of 75 percent.

Vehicular access to the site will be provided by two new driveways from Cowell Boulevard. The project will provide 108-112 vehicular surface parking spaces, including three EV spaces. Bicycle/pedestrian access will be provided through the driveways to Cowell Boulevard, and through a connection to the bicycle path east of the site, connecting to the South Davis greenbelt system. There will be 30 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, 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.
Offsite improvements include a storm drain connection from the site to Albany Avenue, replacement of the existing bicycle path east of the site from Cowell Boulevard to Albany Avenue; installation of a Rapid Rectangular Flashing Beacon for the existing crosswalk on Cowell Boulevard at the bicycle path connection, and restriping Cowell Boulevard to provide room on the north side of the pavement for a bus waiting and boarding area.

Hyatt House Davis incorporates sustainable features into all aspects of its design, construction and operations with the goals of:

- Significantly reducing the environmental footprint of the hotel; and
- Creating a healthy living experience for hotel guests and patrons.

The project will incorporate applicable design requirements from the 2013 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24), and 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. In addition, the applicant has committed to securing Leadership in Energy-Efficient Design (LEED) Gold certification through the United States Green Building Council.

**Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Generation:** The Hyatt House will include the following energy efficiency features to minimize the demand for non-renewable energy:

- Energy Star refrigerators and dishwashers in guest rooms with kitchens
- High efficiency clothes washers in the staff laundry
- Energy Star clothes washers in the guest laundry
- Rooftop solar thermal to serve the staff laundry and kitchen
- Rooftop solar thermal to serve guest rooms and guest laundry
- Storefront glass with lower Solar Heat Gain Coefficient to reduce energy use and improve comfort in the space
- High efficiency HVAC with demand controlled ventilation in common areas
- High efficiency staff kitchen equipment with demand controlled ventilation
- Variable speed pool pumps with timer controls

The proposed design would include photovoltaic panels with approximately 290 kilowatts of potential electricity generation capacity on building roof tops and parking lot shade structures. The PV panels are projected to produce approximate 430,000 kilowatt hours of electricity annually. The total could vary depending on the plan finally approved.

Davis Energy Group (See Appendix B) has modeled the expected performance of the project based on these design specifications, likely operating characteristics, and planned PV installation with the following results:

- Onsite renewable electricity generation will provide approximately 90 percent of the electrical demand of the facility on an annual basis
- Natural gas consumption will be reduced by approximately 30 percent
- Total energy from non-renewable energy resources (i.e., electricity and natural gas) will less reduced by over 60 percent compared to a new hotel designed just to meet Title 24 energy efficiency building standards.

**Water Use And Management:** The following features will be incorporated to reduce water use in the Hyatt House Davis building:

- Low flow faucets, showerheads and toilets in all guest rooms
- Low flow toilets and motion sensor faucets in public and staff restrooms
- Water efficient clothes washing machines in staff and guest laundry rooms
- Water efficient dishwashers in guest rooms
- Laundering guest room linens and towels only upon request

To reduce water use in landscaping, the following features are incorporated:
- Use of drought-tolerant plants in landscaping
- Low flow irrigation system

In addition, rainwater runoff from the parking lots, roof top and other hardscape will flow through a bioswale to remove silt and improve water quality before being discharged to the storm water system.

Sustainable Transportation: Four Unitrans bus stops providing access to two routes are within a 7-minute walk of the hotel front door. The site also is within walking distance of a neighborhood shopping center, parks and athletic facilities.

A city greenbelt forms the south edge of the hotel property and provides pedestrian and bicycle connections to local destinations. Bicycle ride times to downtown (via the Poleline overpass) and campus (via Putah Creek bicycle path) are less than 8 and 12 minutes, respectively. The site is in the immediate vicinity of the Interland/University Research Park as well as the potential future office/research park at 3501 Chiles Road. And, it is only 6 minutes by bicycle to the 2nd Street business corridor via the Dave Pelz bicycle overpass.

To facilitate use of sustainable transportation modes, the following amenities and programs will be marketed and provided to hotel guests and patrons:
- Online information about pedestrian, cycling, and public transportation alternatives available to guests before they arrive
- A Hyatt House shuttle bus, powered by compressed natural gas (CNG), that will connect to Sacramento International Airport, UC Davis and other guest destinations
- Two bicycle parking areas with a minimum of 30 spaces
- Rental/shared bicycles available to guests that will be outfitted with lights, locks, and baskets that can be used to transport groceries, briefcases, etc.
- A points incentive program through the Hyatt Gold Passport loyalty program for guests who utilize alternative transportation while staying at Hyatt House Davis
- Electric vehicle charging stations to promote use of this technology as a more sustainable transportation mode

Waste Reduction And Recycling: During construction of Hyatt House Davis, at least 75 percent of the construction and demolition waste will be diverted from local landfills. This percentage is the minimum required by the U.S. Green Building Council Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) program for New Construction (NC) to achieve a credit towards certification.

The entire facility will be designed to provide for waste reduction and recycling from the common spaces to the operations spaces. Recycling receptacles consistent with City of Davis waste collection and diversion programs will be provided in guest rooms, employee work areas, kitchens, and public areas as well as outdoor collection and pickup locations. A program will be developed to minimize waste generated from food prepared in the hotel kitchen, by merchandise available for sale in the hotel market, and by hotel office functions.
**Sustainability Certifications:** Certification of sustainability programs by a third party ensures that the reporting is accurate and goals are met. Initially, Hyatt House Davis will pursue these certifications:

- U.S. Green Building Council Gold Level Certification in LEED NC program
- City of Davis Partner for a Green Business

The applicant’s stated purposes and objectives can be summarized as follows:

- Provide City of Davis with the first contemporary, upscale guest rooms with state-of-the-art full kitchens and living areas intended to serve guests staying 6-14 days on average.
- Purchased the property so as to improve the parcel that had remained vacant for many years with the hotel use, which would generate needed tax revenue to the City. The project is projected to generate $560,000 per year in Transient Occupancy Tax within 2 years of opening plus an additional $106,000 per year in Visitor Assessment fees for the Yolo County Visitors Bureau to market and promote Davis and Yolo County.
- Meet the business traveler needs given the burgeoning local startup and tech sector; the hotel will be a critical component to such a support system.
- Provide a “necessary complement” to the success of the City Council-approved Embassy Suites hotel/conference project located on Richards Boulevard.

**Policy, Plan, and Zoning Consistency:** The City’s General Plan identifies the site for Business Park uses. The intent of the Business Park designation is to provide locations for administrative, professional, government and medical offices and non-polluting science, technology, light manufacturing and ancillary warehouse facilities in pleasant, pedestrian-oriented mixed-use environmental featuring freeway and airport access, a variety of amenities and high-quality architectural and landscape design. The South Davis Specific Plan (SDSP) identifies the site for “Industrial, Industrial Research & Office Uses.” The site is zoned Preliminary Planned Development #2-12 for industrial research uses. The General Plan, SDSP, and Planned Development amendments adding hotels as a conditionally permitted use and allowing the proposed height, Floor Area Ratio, and landscaped area would bring the General Plan Land Use designation, SDSP, and zoning into consistency. A Minor Modification is requested, to reduce the number of on-site vehicle parking spaces and allow the proposed tower height of 55 feet.

**Previous Relevant Environmental Analysis:** The project site has been included in three previous environmental analyses: the South Davis Specific Plan EIR certified in 1987 by the City Council; as part of the EIR prepared for the City’s 2001 General Plan Update; and the Initial Study and Negative Declaration prepared with the subject site and the adjacent Davis Diamond properties were rezoned from PD #12-87 to PD #2-12 in 2012.

**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 Business Park land use category, for the property at 2750 Cowell Boulevard (APN 069-390-031) only, with a maximum Floor Area Ratio of 1.0;
2. South Davis Specific Plan Amendment to allow a reduction in the otherwise-required 25 percent landscaping, for the property at 2750 Cowell Boulevard (APN 069-390-031) only;
3. P-D#2-12 District Amendment (Zoning Amendment) to add hotels as a conditionally permitted use for the property at 2750 Cowell Boulevard (APN 069-390-031) only, allow the proposed four-story building, and provide flexibility in building signage;
4. Final Planned Development to establish the development standards for the proposed structure;
5. Conditional use permit for the proposed hotel use;
6. Minor Modification to request a ten percent reduction in the required parking spaces and ten percent increase in tower height;
7. Design Review to review the site plan and architecture; and
8. 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.

__________________________________________
November 25, 2016

Signature

Katherine Hess, AICP

Printed Name

City of Davis Community Development & Sustainability
# EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

## I. AESTHETICS

<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) 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. Interstate 80 is not designated as a scenic highway and does not provide a scenic vista. 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 composed of annual grassland and ruderal habitat. There are two valley oak trees on the site: one with three trunks having diameters of six, six, and five inches at 4.5 feet height; and one with a seven-inch diameter at 4.5 feet height. The site is disked or mowed regularly (at least annually), and has been recently mowed. The project would be subject to standard design review conditions regarding articulation of facades, building fenestration and lighting, signage, and construction materials. The applicant has provided photosimulations showing the visibility of the hotel structure from the residential properties. Much of the view of the Project from the south is screened by large trees in the City greenbelt and the yards of the adjacent residential subdivisions, depending on location of the property. Based upon public comment, the Project Description has been revised to includes screening on third- and fourth-floor south-facing windows to reduce visibility into homes and yards across the greenbelt. The existing zoning allows a fifty-foot building. With a maximum of three stories. Although the proposed project includes four stories, the overall height of the hotel structure, and potential impacts on aesthetics and privacy, are no different than would be allowed under existing regulations. Moreover, the proposed 60-foot setback from the southern property line.
greatly exceeds the 25-foot setback that might be proposed for a research/office building, which would have a greater potential of allowing employees or visitors to view properties to the south, as shows in Architectural submittal exhibit A19. 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 lights along Cowell Boulevard and greenbelt lights south of the Project site. The Project is in an area that is surrounded by existing industrial, office, residential homes and roadways, where lighting, such as street lighting exists. The four-story structure will also have windows that have the potential of being visible from nearby residential properties when the lights are on and curtains are opened. The applicant has prepared photosimulations showing that the existing greenbelt and private trees provide extensive – but not complete - screening of the hotel structure and its lights from the adjacent residential properties. However, the area already contains street lighting along Cowell Boulevard and Albany Avenue, greenbelt lighting adjacent to the Project site, and headlights from vehicles on Interstate 80. The addition of buildings, including windows that may cast light, would not be considered to be substantial light or glare that would adversely affect views. In addition, the applicant has proposed, and the City will implement through conditions of approval, the requirement that any new lighting will comply with the City’s outdoor lighting control ordinance and standard conditions of approval and impacts are less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. AGRICULTURAL 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>
II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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) 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>
</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>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis below is based on the Air Quality Impact Analysis – Hyatt House Project, Davis, prepared by LSA Associates, February 2, 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 2: Project Construction Emissions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reactive Organic Gases (tons/year)</th>
<th>Nitrogen Oxides (tons/year)</th>
<th>PM$_{10}$ (pounds/day)$^{(a)}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Emissions</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo-Solano AQMD Significance Threshold</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceed?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: LSA Associates, Inc. 2016*

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>PM$_{10}$ (pounds/day)$^{(a)}$</th>
<th>PM$_{2.5}$ (pounds/day)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Emissions</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo-Solano AQMD 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>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: LSA Associates, Inc. 2016*

Because the proposed project would result in construction-related and operational emissions below the applicable thresholds of significance and would comply with applicable YSAQMD 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 E). 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 155 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
Risks 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. However, because portions of the project site are located within 500 feet of I-80, the increased risk associated with exposure to freeway emissions was evaluated.

California’s Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) has determined that longterm 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 14 days. Based on our 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.

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.
## IV. BIOLOGICAL 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) 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) 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>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) 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>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) 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>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vegetation on the site is composed of annual grassland and ruderal habitat. There are two valley oak trees on the site: one with three trunks having diameters of six, six, and five inches at 4.5 feet height; and one with a seven-inch diameter at 4.5 feet height. The site is disked or mowed regularly (at least annually), and has been recently mowed. The City greenbelt south of the site contains a mix of native and non-native trees in varying states of health.

Response a): Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation
The Initial Study for the Davis Diamonds rezoning application noted that the 3.37 acre parcel located at 2750 Cowell Boulevard may support burrowing owl habitat. The western burrowing owl (a Federal Bird of Conservation Concern and state Species of Special Concern) is known to exist in the City of Davis. Burrowing owls are transient during the fall and winter months and could easily settle into the burrows onsite. Suitable Swainson’s hawk nesting habit 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 nests located within ¼ mile of the project site. Mitigation would be required to reduce potential significant impacts to a less than significant level.

Burrowing Owl Nesting Habitat
The site is frequently mowed and supports a small colony of California ground squirrel. The site contains multiple small mammal burrows that are potentially suitable for burrowing owl nesting and cover. Burrowing owls are not known to currently use the property.

There is a chance that burrowing owls could be attracted to the site between now and development. Direct or indirect impacts to nests or individuals of these species may occur as a result of construction, and would therefore be considered potentially significant. The following mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce potential direct and indirect impacts to burrowing owl nesting habitat to a less than significant level.

1. Disturbance to Burrowing Owl Nesting
   1. A preconstruction survey for burrowing owls shall be conducted no sooner than two weeks prior to soil disturbing work.
      a) If owls are confirmed using the property during the non-breeding season (September 1 through January 31), then the owls may be passively excluded by a qualified biologist as described in the California Department of Fish and Wildlife’s (CDFW) 2012 Burrowing Owl Mitigation Guidelines with an approved owl Exclusion Plan.
      b) If the site is occupied by owls during the breeding season (Feb 1 through August 31), then no soil disturbance or construction activity may occur until the owls’ reproductive cycle has finished (as verified by a qualified biologist) and the owls have been excluded in accordance to CDFW 2012 guidelines with an approved Exclusion Plan passively relocated.

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. As such, the site is not considered suitable foraging habitat. There are no known active or historic Swainson’s hawk nesting sites within one-quarter (1/4) mile of the project site. Suitable nest trees do not occur on-site. However, there are suitable nest trees in the vicinity of the site (associated with the adjacent greenbelt and I-80 corridor). 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.
2. **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 the start of construction activity or any work affecting the trees on the greenbelt. The ¼ mile distance shall reflect the area to be affected by the tree pruning, storm drain extension, and bike path replacement in addition to the subject property.
   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 undeveloped with vegetation, which is largely composed of grasses. 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**
Although the greenbelts in Davis provide connected corridors that serve wildlife as well as humans, the Project site is in a highly urbanized area and proposed changes to the bicycle connections (such as asphalt replacement to the bicycle connection from Cowell Boulevard to Albany Avenue, construction impacts will be temporary and no long-term impacts are anticipated. Therefore, the project will have a **less-than-significant impact** relative to this issue.

**Response e): Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation**
The analysis in this section is based on three arborist reports:


These reports are included in Appendices F-H.

**On-site Trees**
The two existing Valley Oak trees on the site are proposed for removal and will be subject to the obligations of Section 37.03.070(d)(2) of the City’s Tree Preservation Ordinance, which requires mitigation through planting of replacement trees or payment to the Tree Preservation Fund in Lieu of Replacement.
Greenbelt Trees Adjacent to Project Site
Construction of the Project has the potential to affect trees on the greenbelt south of the site, through impacts to their root system from earthwork, or impacts to their canopy from clearance requirements for fire lane and parking uses. The Tree Preservation, City of Davis Greenbelt Trees, Hyatt House Project report concludes that none of the pruning will negatively impact the health or structure of all but one of the trees, with recommendations to minimize development impacts.

The following mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to greenbelt trees adjacent to the project site (with the exception of Tree #8) to a less than significant level.

### 3. Impact on Greenbelt Trees

a. Revise parking lot detail to utilize drain rock rather than AB in between concrete strips.

b. Specify on plans to excavate for curb installation with water or air under ISA Certified Arborist supervision. If roots greater than or equal to 2 inches in diameter are encountered, bridge curb over roots allowing space for roots to expand in girth.

c. Conduct a meeting to discuss tree preservation guidelines with the Consulting Arborist and all contractors, subcontractors and project managers prior to the initiation of demolition and construction.

d. Prior to any demolition activity on site, identify (tagged) trees to be preserved and install tree protection fencing in a circle centered at the tree trunk with a radius equal to the defined tree protection zone (see table) unless otherwise indicated in construction plans. Tree protection fences shall be made of chain link with posts sunk into the ground. These fences shall not be removed or moved until construction is complete. Avoid soil or above ground disturbances within the fenced area.

e. Any pruning required for construction or recommended in this report shall be performed by an ISA Certified Arborist or Tree Worker. Pruning for necessary clearance shall be the minimum required to build the project and performed prior to demolition by an ISA Certified Arborist.

f. Avoid grading, compaction, trenching, rototilling, vehicle traffic, material storage, spoil, waste or washout or any other disturbance within tree protection zones (TPZ’s) outside of drive and parking areas.

g. Any work that is to occur within the protection zones of the trees shall be monitored by the Consulting Arborist.

h. If roots larger than 1 inch or limbs larger than 3 inches in diameter are cut or damaged during construction, contact Consulting Arborist as soon as possible to inspect and recommend appropriate remedial treatments.

i. All trees to be preserved shall be irrigated once every week during non-Winter months to uniformly wet the soil to a depth of at least 18 inches under and beyond their canopies.

Tree #8, a callery pear, 8” Diameter at Breast Height, with fair health and poor structure, would have 50 percent of its foliage removed to provide clearance over the fire lane and parking areas and to correct its poor structure. The arborist report recommended this pruning but did not conclude that tree health would not be compromised. The following mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to Tree #8 to a less than significant level.

### 4. Impact on Tree #8

a. Property owner shall comply with all provisions of Mitigation Measure #3 for Tree #8.

b. Property owner shall post a bond or other security for the appraised value of Tree #8 prior to the issuance of building permits, which will be released if the trees are still healthy upon
completion of the 18-month monitoring period. The value of any damage to the tree will be taken from the bond and deposited into the City’s tree preservation fund, as established in Section 37.030.070(b) of the Municipal Code.

Bicycle Connection Trees (West of Project Site)
The storm drain connection and bicycle path replacement requires construction of a 36-inch trench from Cowell Boulevard to Albany Avenue. Replacing the existing asphalt concrete path with a Portland cement path will bring the facility to City standard, and can be completed with no additional soil compaction beyond the trench required for the storm drain pipe. The storm drain connection and bicycle path replacement have the potential to affect two Chinese tallow trees and four Canary Island Pines. The Greenbelt Tree Preservation, Public Storm Drain, Hyatt House Project report concluded that impacts to the Chinese tallow trees would likely experience a low level of impact, given construction assumptions and compliance with preservation recommendations.

The following mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to the Chinese Tallow Trees to a less than significant level.

5. **Impact on Chinese Tallow Trees**
   a. Conduct a meeting to discuss tree preservation guidelines with the Consulting Arborist and all contractors, subcontractors and project managers prior to the initiation of demolition and construction.
   b. Prior to any demolition activity on site, identify trees to be preserved and install tree protection fencing in a circle centered at the tree trunk with a radius equal to one foot per inch trunk diameter (outside of paved areas). Tree protection fences shall be made of chain link with posts sunk into the ground. These fences shall not be removed or moved until construction is complete.
   c. Pruning for necessary equipment clearance shall be the minimum required to build the project and performed prior to demolition by an ISA Certified Arborist or Certified Tree Worker.
   d. Avoid grading, compaction, trenching, rototilling, vehicle traffic, material storage, spoil, waste or washout or any other disturbance within tree protection zones. Any work that is to occur within the protection zones of the trees shall be monitored by the Consulting Arborist.
   e. If roots larger than 1 inch or limbs larger than 3 inches in diameter are cut or damaged during construction, contact Consulting Arborist as soon as possible to inspect and recommend appropriate remedial treatments.
   f. All trees to be preserved shall be irrigated once every week during non-Winter months to uniformly wet the soil to a depth of at least 18 inches under and beyond their canopies.

Four Canary Island Pines are located south of the Chinese tallow trees, between the City greenbelt and Albany Avenue. These trees are closer to the proposed storm drain trench and have a greater potential of impacts from the construction. The Greenbelt Tree Preservation, Public Storm Drain, Hyatt House Project report recommended either horizontal bore or preservation of all roots larger than two inches. Neither of these methods has been determined to be practical, due to the constraints of construction in the greenbelt, bike path, and Albany Avenue; the need for the storm drain line to be as straight as possible; and the necessary proximity of the trench to the existing Canary Island Pines.
The City Arborist is recommending the following mitigation measure to reduce potential impacts to the Canary Island Pines to a less than significant level:

6. **Impact on Canary Pine Trees**
   
   a. Compliance with all measures identified in Mitigation Measure #5 for the Chinese tallow trees, above.
   
   b. Between November 1 and January 31, and no less than two weeks before trenching for the storm drain in the area of the Canary Island Pines, applicant shall remove the asphalt and prune the roots of the trees within the required three-foot trench area. The path may be closed as necessary with proper notice to the satisfaction of the Public Works Department.
   
   c. Consulting Arborist shall monitor health of the trees and provide monthly reports to the City of Davis Arborist and Department of Community Development and Sustainability, from the onset of construction in the area through 18 months from completion of construction near the trees.
   
   d. Property owner shall post a bond or other security for the appraised value of the Canary Island Pines prior to the approval of improvement drawings for the storm drain and bicycle path replacement, which will be released if the trees are still healthy upon completion of the 18-month monitoring period. The value of any damage to the trees will be taken from the bond and deposited into the City’s tree preservation fund, as established in Section 37.030.070(b) of the Municipal Code.

Compliance with these mitigation measures will ensure that the impact to on-site, greenbelt, and bicycle path trees is **less than significant**.

**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)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</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>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/affected.aspx). 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 groundshaking 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.
### VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>☒</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>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis below is based on the Air Quality Impact Analysis – Hyatt House Project, Davis, prepared by LSA Associates, February 2, 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 extra 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 that contribute to global warming and climate change impacts. Although the contribution from an individual project may be minor, the cumulative impact can be substantial. The YSAQMD has not established specific thresholds applicable to 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 development projects. By 2050, the City’s CO2 target is 80 percent below 1990 levels. The D-CAAP includes 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 341 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 energy reduction measures, including Energy-Star appliances in guest rooms; high efficiency clothes washers; high efficiency HVAC common areas; variable speed pool pumps; low solar heat gain coefficient storefront glass; 70 percent solar thermal serving laundry; 50 percent solar thermal serving guest rooms; high efficiency kitchen equipment; and photovoltaic solar panels (see Project Description). These measures would greatly reduce the energy consumption and subsequent greenhouse gas emissions associated with the project.

Table 4 shows the calculated greenhouse gas emissions for the proposed project. Mobile source emissions are the largest source of greenhouse gas emissions at approximately 69 percent of the total. Energy use is the next largest category at approximately 27 percent of CO2e emissions. Waste and water source emissions are approximately 3 percent and 1 percent, respectively. 95.2 MTCOe credit for on-site renewable energy (photovoltaic panels on roof)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions Source Category</th>
<th>CO₂</th>
<th>CH₄</th>
<th>N₂O</th>
<th>CO₂e</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>256.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>257.8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile</td>
<td>653.2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>653.7</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Operational Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emissions Source Category</th>
<th>CO₂</th>
<th>CH₄</th>
<th>N₂O</th>
<th>CO₂e</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Emissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>946.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*Source: LSA Associates, Inc. 2016*

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 (e.g., Bay Area Air Quality Management District, South Coast Air Quality Management District) 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 946.9 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 conflict with plans adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and impacts are considered less than significant.

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

As discussed above, the project would not generate substantial emissions. Additionally, the proposed project would include energy reducing measures that are consistent with the D-CAAP. The project would be located near a bike trail and would provide 25 bicycles for hotel guests to use. Water reduction measures include low flow faucets and shower heads to be installed in the guest rooms. Therefore, the sustainability measures included in the proposed project 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 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) 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>
<tr>
<td>e) 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>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) 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>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) 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>
<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 (Marguerite Montgomery Elementary School) is more than a quarter-mile to the south. 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 compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 (Cortese List). The closest airport is located approximately 2 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>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</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>
<tr>
<td>d) 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>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) 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>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) 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>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) 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>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</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>

**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 (20,452 sf), parking lots and outdoor gathering areas, and parking/drive areas. 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 flows into a drainage channel to the south, and eventually to Putah Creek. Preliminary grading and drainage plans show runoff from the project will be collected via an underground vault and transmitted through a new storm drain line to the existing
lines in Albany Avenue, south of the project site. 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 and an underground vault 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 undeveloped and surrounded by developed areas. 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 “Business Park” designation and PD #2-12, Industrial Research zoning. The project applicants are requesting a General Plan Amendment and rezoning to add hotels as conditionally permitted uses for this specific site, 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 proposed hotel is not significantly different from the service station or restaurants that are conditionally permitted within the Planned Development. The General Plan Amendment 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>
<tr>
<td>e) 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>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) 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>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis below is based on the Noise Impact Study for Hyatt House in Davis, California prepared by Acoustical Engineering Consultants, December 30, 2015. A copy of this report is included in Appendix D.

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 site and will continue to be so for the next 20 years.

**Responses a) and c): Less Than Significant Impact**
Exterior noise guidelines are given in Chapter 21 of the City of Davis General Plan 1. The City does not set specific noise level limits for development of transient lodging projects other than encouraging development within the “Normally Acceptable” exterior standard and allowing
development within the “Conditionally Acceptable” range once a noise study has been completed. For transient lodging, the normally acceptable range is an exterior day-night average, $L_{dn}$, sound level of 60 dB(A) or less and 60 dB(A) to 75 dB(A) for the conditionally acceptable range. The predicted existing $L_{dn}$ sound levels at the proposed location of the north face of the hotel building closest to the major noise sources is 68 dB(A) at a height of 5 feet above ground. Cumulative plus project $L_{dn}$ sound levels in the year 2035 are predicted to reach 72 dB(A) for the north façade without mitigation due to increases in overall road traffic volumes and changing site condition assumptions, which is still within the “Conditionally Acceptable” range. The increase in road traffic due to the project itself will be minimal (resulting in less than 0.5 dB(A) increase in overall levels) and insignificant per the City’s standards. Existing and cumulative plus project noise levels for the site fall within the conditionally acceptable range per the General Plan. Although the project will add some non-transportation sources to the site (e.g. mechanical equipment), $L_{dn}$ sound levels will decrease at residents along Albany Avenue due to significant shielding of transportation noise sources from the proposed hotel building. No mitigation is required.

Under the performance method of compliance with Cal Green (5.507.4.2), the interior environment must meet an hourly $L_{eq}$ of 50 dBA in occupied areas during any hour of operation based on acoustical analysis. Sound levels are predicted to be 48 dB(A) or less for habitable rooms using the exterior sound level data and proposed exterior construction assumptions, consistent with Cal Green requirements. No mitigation is required to meet interior sound levels.

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

**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 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 approximately 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.
### XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

<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>
<tbody>
<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. The storm drain connection to Albany Avenue does not extend through an undeveloped area or remove a barrier to additional development elsewhere. 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/lfmonth/countyur-400c.pdf](http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/file/lfmonth/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.
Would the project:

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</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>Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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, across Interstate 80 from the project site. 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 Council 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.

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 adjacent to a public greenbelt and about a half-mile from Willowcreek neighborhood park and Playfields district park. 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. Participants in gymnastics events at the adjacent Davis Diamonds facility, or tournaments at the nearby Playfields Park, may choose to stay at the hotel, which would provide convenient access to activities. Consequently, the project’s impacts on recreation will be less than significant.
**Response b): Less Than Significant Impact**

Replacement of the bicycle path connecting Cowell Boulevard to Albany Drive will bring that facility to current City of Davis standard. Although the bicycle connection will be closed during the time required for the storm drain construction, there is another connection from the greenbelt to Albany Avenue at Benbow Court, approximately 400 feet to the east, so bicycle connectivity will be retained. The project includes recreational facilities typical of an extended-stay hotel, such as a swimming pool and gathering areas. Impacts are addressed as part of the overall project within this Initial Study, and are less than significant.

### XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

<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 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>
</tbody>
</table>
The following analysis and conclusions are based on a Traffic Impact Analysis for Hyatt House Hotel Project prepared by KD Anderson & Associates, Inc., dated January 12, 2016. A copy of this report is included in Appendix E.

Adequacy of parking is not addressed in this CEQA analysis because the requirement was removed from the Initial Study checklist in 2009.

**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 trip generation of the project was computed using rates published in Trip Generation (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 9th Edition, 2013) based on the projected use. 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.

Existing a.m. and p.m. traffic volumes were obtained from the recently completed traffic impact studies for the Davis Hotel Conference Center and the Mace Ranch Innovation Center. With the addition of the Project to the existing traffic conditions, all intersections will continue to operate within the City’s Level of Service threshold, at LOS C or better. The all-way stop controlled intersection at Cowell Blvd / Drummond Avenue / Chiles Road operates acceptably and will not meet the peak hour signal warrant. Thus, the project’s traffic impacts are not significant from the standpoint of City LOS policy.

KDA conducted a similar analysis for “Existing Plus Approved Projects” plus the proposed Project, and concluded that “All intersections will continue to operate within the City’s Level of Service threshold, at LOS C or better. A peak hour warrant analysis was conducted, and none of the unsignalized intersections meet the peak hour warrant.” 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 approximately 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 Project will include a Rapid Rectangular Flashing Beacon on Cowell Boulevard to facilitate bicycle and pedestrian crossing. The proposed project will use the existing bike and pedestrian path along Fifth 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 slightly over a mile from the project site, to the east 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 Cowell Boulevard. Therefore, there is no impact.

Response f): No Impact
There are existing bike paths and lanes within the area, including a bicycle lane on Cowell Boulevard and a bicycle path connecting to the Putah Creek Parkway from the greenbelt at the southern edge of the Project site. 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 Cowell Boulevard and would not conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation. Therefore, there are no impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</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) 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>
</tbody>
</table>
### XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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)-b), d)-g): Less Than Significant Impact**

Due to the relative size and nature of the proposed project, impacts to local and regional water supplies 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 **less than significant.**

**Response c) Less than Significant Impact after Mitigation.**

Construction of the storm drain connection to Albany Avenue and replacement of the bicycle path from Cowell Boulevard to Albany Avenue have the potential of causing impacts to burrowing owls, Swainson’s hawks, and/or existing trees. Compliance with Mitigation Measures 1, 2, 5, and 6 will reduce impacts to **less than significant after mitigation.**
<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 After 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. Although relatively unlikely, based upon the current land cover types found on-site, special-status wildlife species and/or federally- or state-protected birds could be occupying the site. 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 includes mitigation measures and 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, mitigation measures for all potentially significant project-level impacts identified for the proposed project in this IS/MND have been included that would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels. As such, the project's incremental contribution towards cumulative impacts would not be considered significant. In particular, the Traffic Impact Analysis by kd Anderson (Appendix D) addressed potential cumulative impacts of the Project and concluded that impacts at General Plan Buildout would continue to be less than 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 **significant**.
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