

**1**

**INTRODUCTION**

**1.1 PURPOSE AND INTENDED USES OF THIS EIR**

---

The Lincoln40 Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) as amended. The City of Davis is the lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed project evaluated herein and has the principal responsibility for approving the project. As required by Section 15121 of the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR will (a) inform public agency decision-makers, and the public generally, of the significant environmental effects of the project, (b) identify possible ways to minimize the significant adverse environmental effects, and (c) describe reasonable and feasible project alternatives which reduce environmental effects. The public agency shall consider the information in the EIR along with other information that may be presented to the agency in deciding whether to approve the application.

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

**1.2 PROPOSED PROJECT**

---

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

**Project Location**

The 5.92-acre proposed project site is located along Olive Drive, immediately south of the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks and the Davis Amtrak station, in the City of Davis. The project site is bisected by Hickory Lane. Regional access to the project site is provided by the Interstate 80/Richards Boulevard interchange, located south of the project site. The site is composed of 11 separate parcels identified as Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 070-280-010, -012, -013, -014, -015, -016, -017 and 070-290-001, -002, -003, and -004.

The proposed project site is generally flat and consists of a small field, approximately 180 trees, and 24 residential units. The existing residential units include 10 single-family homes and an old lodging facility that was previously converted into a 14-unit apartment complex. The apartment complex is currently fully occupied. At the time of issuance of the Notice of Preparation (NOP), six of the 10 single-family homes were occupied by renters; of the remaining four units, three were uninhabitable and one was vacant.

The Davis Amtrak Station, Downtown Davis, and single-family residences are located northwest of the project site, across the UPRR tracks. Existing single-family homes and one small office building are located immediately west of the site. Multi-family residential developments and a self-storage facility are located to the south and east of the site, across Olive Drive.

### **Project Components**

The proposed project would include the demolition of an existing apartment complex and 10 single-family homes on-site and the construction of a 249,788-square-foot (sf) student-oriented residential building. The project would include a total of 130 units and would be designed specifically as off-campus student-oriented housing. The building would be designed to include three tiers that step away from Olive Drive. The first tier (closest to Olive Drive) would be three stories tall, the second would be four stories tall, and the third would be five stories tall, with a maximum height of 60 feet. The five-story portion would be connected to the three- and four-story portions on the first floor and by hallways on floors two through four. The proposed project would include a total of 130 rental units, an increase of 106 units over existing baseline conditions on the project site.

The first floors of each structure would be connected as one large floor and consist of the lobby, manager's office, mail room, 16 residential units, a game/theater room, multiple lounges and study spaces, a fitness center, a bike shop, indoor bicycle storage, and three restroom facilities. The remaining floors would consist of residential units and study spaces.

The proposed project would include a mix of two-bedroom to five-bedroom fully-furnished units, each approximately 1,024 to 1,797 sf in size. The proposed project would include 473 bedrooms, of which 235 bedrooms would be designed as double-occupancy rooms resulting in a total of 708 beds. Double-occupancy would not be allowed in any other rooms. It should also be noted that no more than two tenants would be allowed in double-occupancy rooms. Unlike traditional apartments, the proposed project would be leased by the bed and not by the unit. For each lease, the tenant would be given personalized access rights to the common areas (pool area, clubhouse, study rooms, secured bike areas and main apartment building), assigned unit and also the tenant's specific bedroom.

The project would also include the construction of an auxiliary bicycle storage structure, a resort-style pool with barbecues and fire pits, and multiple outdoor lounge areas. The proposed project would include a total of 104,860 sf of outdoor open space/landscaping.

Access to the proposed project would be provided by two entry/exit points – one existing access point and one proposed access point. The existing access point is through Hickory Lane, while

the proposed access point would be off of Olive Drive. The project would include 240 surface parking spaces and 725 bicycle parking spaces.

Infrastructure for the proposed project site would be extended from nearby utilities to serve the site with public water supply, wastewater collection, and stormwater detention.

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

---

The Legislature has adopted several statutory provisions to streamline CEQA for infill development within this region of the State that are consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) adopted by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), including but not limited to Public Resources Code sections 21094.5-21094.5.5,<sup>1</sup> 21155-21155.4, 21159.28, and 21099. SACOG has released a MTP/SCS Consistency Determination Worksheet for jurisdictions to use in evaluating whether a proposed project is consistent with SACOG's MTP/SCS.<sup>2</sup>

A project's consistency with the MTP/SCS is determined using project based criteria (e.g. density requirements) and location-based criteria (e.g. proximity to transit). SACOG assists jurisdictions in making an MTP/SCS consistency determination; however, it is the lead agency's responsibility to make the final determination. As such, the City of Davis prepared a draft MTP/SCS Consistency Determination worksheet for review by SACOG. On October 3, 2016, SACOG provided the City of Davis with a letter of concurrence stating that SACOG agrees with the City's conclusion that the proposed project would be consistent with the MTP/SCS. Specifically, SACOG states:

Given the project's mix and density of land uses (over 20 dwelling units per acre and over 50 percent of square footage in residential use), the project's location within the Yolo Transit Priority Area, and its consistency with the use, density/intensity and applicable policies of the MTP/SCS, the Lincoln40 project is considered a Transit Priority Project, as defined by SB 375 (PRC § 21155(b)).<sup>3</sup>

Streamlining benefits applicable to qualifying in-fill projects that are consistent with SACOG's MTP/SCS include:

1. The EIR is not required to reference, describe, or discuss (1) growth inducing impacts, or (2) any project specific or cumulative impacts from cars and light-duty truck trips generated by the project on global warming or the regional transportation network. (Pub.

---

<sup>1</sup> See also sections 15183-15183.3 and Appendix M of the CEQA Guidelines.

<sup>2</sup> MTP/SCS worksheet available at <http://www.sacog.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/determination-mtp-scs-consistency-worksheet.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup> Sacramento Area Council of Governments. *Lincoln40 Student Housing Apartment project consistency with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy for 2036*. October 3, 2016.

- Resources Code, § 21159.28, subd. (a); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21094.5, subd. (b)(2).)
2. Alternative locations, densities, and building intensities to the proposed project need not be considered. (Pub. Resources Code, § § 21094.5, subd. (b)(1); see also Pub. Resources Code, § 21159.28, subd. (b).)
  3. Aesthetic and parking impacts should not be considered significant impacts on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21099, subd. (d)(1).)

The City understands that while the above listed topics may not be required to be included in the EIR for the purposes of complying with CEQA under such a finding, for the purpose of public disclosure these issues are addressed in the Lincoln40 EIR to the extent determined appropriate by the City.

#### **1.4 EIR PROCESS**

---

The EIR process begins with the decision by the lead agency to prepare an EIR, either during a preliminary review of a project or at the conclusion of an Initial Study. Once the decision is made to prepare an EIR, the lead agency sends a NOP to appropriate government agencies and, when required, to the State Clearinghouse (SCH) in the Office of Planning and Research (OPR), which will ensure that responsible and trustee State agencies reply within the required time. The SCH assigns an identification number to the project, which then becomes the identification number for all subsequent environmental documents on the project. Commenting agencies have 30 days to respond to the NOP and provide information regarding alternatives and mitigation measures they wish to have explored in the Draft EIR and to provide notification regarding whether the agency will be a responsible agency or a trustee agency for the project. An NOP (see Appendix A), as well as a detailed Initial Study (see Appendix B), was prepared for the proposed project and was circulated from August 29, 2016 to September 27, 2016. A public scoping meeting was held on September 15, 2016 for the purpose of informing the public and receiving comments on the scope of the environmental analysis to be prepared for the proposed project. See Section 1.6 below for a summary of comments received on the NOP.

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

A Final EIR will be prepared, containing comments and responses to comments on the Draft EIR. The Final EIR will also include any changes to the Draft EIR text made as a result of public comment. Before approving a project, the lead agency shall certify that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, and that the Final EIR has been presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency, which has reviewed and considered the EIR. The lead agency shall also certify that the Final EIR reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis.

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

## **1.5 SCOPE OF THE EIR**

---

This EIR constitutes a project-level analysis for the Lincoln40 Project and, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15161, covers "all phases of the project including planning, construction, and operation." State CEQA Guidelines § 15126.2(a) states, in pertinent part:

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

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

### **Environmental Issues Dismissed in the Initial Study**

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

- *Aesthetics (a, b)*: The City of Davis, according to the City of Davis General Plan Program EIR, has determined that the Planning Area of the General Plan does not contain officially designated scenic highways, corridors, vistas, or viewing areas. Given that established scenic vistas are not located on or adjacent to the project site, the proposed project would have a *less-than-significant* impact related to scenic vistas. Furthermore,

according to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) map of designated and eligible scenic routes under the California Scenic Highway Program, officially-designated State Scenic Highways are not located in the vicinity of the project site. Accordingly, development of the proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway, and impacts would be *less than significant*.

- *Agriculture and Forest Resources (a-e)*: The proposed project site is identified as “Urban and Built-Up Land” in the Yolo County Important Farmland 2014 map. As such, development of the proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use, and the proposed project’s impact related to such would be *less than significant*. In addition, buildout of the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract, and *no impact* would occur related to such. Forest lands are not located within the project area, nor does the project site contain any portions zoned for forest land or Timberland Production. Therefore, the proposed project would have *no impact* with regard to conversion of forest land or any potential conflict with forest land, timberland, or Timberland Production zoning.
- *Geology and Soils (ai-aiv, e)*: Damage to structures and risks to people from ground rupture and ground failure would be highly unlikely at the project site, and all project structures would be required to adhere to the provisions of the California Building Code (CBC). Therefore, impacts related to ground rupture and strong seismic ground shaking would be *less than significant*. In addition, the Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the proposed project site determined that the potential for liquefaction to occur on the project site during a seismic event would be low. As noted above, all project structures would be required to adhere to CBC design standards. Therefore, impacts related to seismic hazards such as liquefaction would be *less than significant*. Furthermore, significant slopes that would create a danger of landslide on- or off-site do not exist at the site. Therefore, *no impact* related to landslides would occur. According to the Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the proposed project, expansive and/or potentially compressible soils exist on the project site; however, implementation of Mitigation Measure VI-1 set forth in the Initial Study, which requires the project to comply with the recommendations set forth in the Geotechnical Investigation, would ensure any impacts related to such would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. Lastly, the project would not require the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems, and *no impact* would occur relating to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks.
- *Hazards and Hazardous Materials (a, c-h)*: During construction and operation of the proposed project, proper handling and usage of potentially hazardous materials in accordance with label instructions would ensure that adverse impacts to human health or the environment would not result. In addition, the Phase 1 ESA prepared for the proposed project found that the project is not located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, the project would have a *less-than-significant* impact with respect to creating a significant

hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials or being located on a hazardous materials site. The proposed project would not be located within 0.25-mile of an existing or proposed school, and, thus, a *less-than-significant* impact would occur associated with the handling of hazardous materials within 0.25-mile of a school. The project area is not located within the vicinity of a public airport or a private airstrip, nor is the site within an airport land use plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not create safety hazards for people living or working in the project area as a result of being in close proximity to an airport, and *no impact* would occur. Furthermore, the proposed project does not involve any operations or changes to the existing roadway network that would impair implementation or physically interfere with the City's Multi-Hazard Functional Planning Guide or the County's Emergency Operations Plan. Therefore, the project would have a *less-than-significant* impact with respect to impairing implementation of or physically interfering with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Lastly, wildland fires are not anticipated to pose a significant risk to the site, and a *less-than-significant* impact related to such would occur.

- *Hydrology and Water Quality (g-j)*: Based on the Yolo County Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), development of the proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard zone nor place structures within a 100-year floodplain that would impede or redirect flood flows, and restrictions on development or special requirements associated with flooding are not required for the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam, and a *less-than-significant* impact would occur. In addition, because the City of Davis is not located near waters subject to tidal changes, closed bodies of water, or hilly or mountainous terrain, *no impact* related to seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows would occur.
- *Land Use and Planning (a)*: Rather than dividing an established community, the proposed project would be considered in-fill development within the Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan area. Because the project would be considered in-fill development, and would not result in a division of an established community, the proposed project would have a *less-than-significant* impact related to such.
- *Mineral Resources (a-b)*: The only mineral resource known to exist in the City of Davis Planning Area is natural gas, and specific resource areas for such have not been identified within the vicinity of the proposed project site. Due to the lack of mineral resources in the Planning Area, a *less-than-significant* impact related to mineral resources would occur.
- *Noise (e-f)*: The UC Davis Airport, located approximately three miles southwest of the project site, is the only airport in the immediate vicinity of Davis. The airport is used almost exclusively for flight training and for infrequent, short-duration operations. According to the City's General Plan Update EIR, impacts to noise-sensitive uses do not

occur related to the UC Davis Airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not be exposed to excessive air traffic noise, and *no impact* would occur.

- *Transportation and Circulation (c)*: The proposed project does not include air travel. In addition, the proposed project would not be located near, or affect in any way, air traffic patterns at the UC Davis airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in air traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks, and *no impact* would occur.

## **Environmental Issues Addressed in this EIR**

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

- Aesthetics and Visual Resources;
- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions;
- Biological Resources;
- Cultural Resources;
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials;
- Hydrology and Water Quality;
- Land Use and Planning;
- Noise;
- Population and Housing;
- Public Services and Recreation;
- Transportation and Circulation; and
- Utilities and Service Systems.

The evaluation of effects is presented on a resource-by-resource basis in Sections 4.1 through 4.12. Each section is divided into the following four sections: Introduction, Existing Environmental Setting, Regulatory Context, and Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

### Scope of Cumulative Analysis

Two approaches exist to identifying cumulative projects and their associated impacts. The “list” approach identifies individual projects known to be occurring or proposed in the surrounding area in order to identify potential cumulative impacts. The “projection” approach uses a summary of projections in adopted General Plans or related planning documents to identify potential cumulative impacts. This EIR uses the projection approach for the cumulative analysis and considers the development anticipated to occur upon buildout of the Davis General Plan (i.e., Davis city limits). In addition, this EIR also considers a combined list/projections approach for the following quantifiable CEQA topics: traffic, noise, and utilities (water and wastewater), for which buildout of the Davis city limits is considered, as well as buildout of the Mace Ranch Innovation Center Project and associated Mace Triangle, as well as the Nishi Gateway Project. It is important to note that the combined list/projections approach is referred to as the “CEQA Cumulative Scenario” in the Transportation and Circulation Chapter of the EIR. Both approaches



include the approved Embassy Suites Hotel / Conference Center project. These cumulative traffic scenarios and assumptions are described in greater detail in Section 4.11 of this EIR.

## **1.6 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE NOP**

---

The City of Davis received 24 comment letters during the open comment period on the NOP for the Lincoln40 Project EIR, as well as three verbal comments at the scoping meeting. A copy of each letter and scoping meeting transcript is provided in Appendix C of this EIR. The following letters were authored by public agencies, residents, groups, organizations, and other interested parties.

### **Public Agencies**

- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Department of Transportation
- Native American Heritage Commission
- Yocha Dehe Cultural Resources
- Yolo Habitat Conservancy

### **Residents, Groups, and Organizations**

- Peter Stanzler – Friends of Olive Drive
- Mark Grote, Joel Brungardt, and Valerie Jones - Old East Davis Neighborhood Association (2)
- Donald and Carlos Asbill
- Cynthia Goldberg
- Suresh Kumar
- Margot Loschke
- Seanna McLaughlin
- Bob Milbrodt
- Alan C. Miller
- Rhonda Reed
- Eileen M. Samitz
- Isabel Shaskan
- Colin Walsh
- Jon C. Watterson
- Bob Wertzberger
- Matt Williams
- David D. Young (2)

### **Verbal Comments Submitted at Scoping Meeting**

- Jon Watterson
- David Young

- Michael Harrington

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

<p><b><u>Aesthetics and Visual Resources</u></b> (Section 4.1)</p>	<p>Concerns related to the following issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased light associated with the project.</li> <li>• Decrease of sunlight due to five-stories associated with the project.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u></b> (Section 4.2)</p>	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased emissions from onsite uses.</li> <li>• Impacts concerning odors as a result of the proposed project.</li> <li>• Proposed project is close to train, highway, and Richards Boulevard; detrimental to air quality for residents.</li> <li>• Analysis of airborne pollution from increased traffic.</li> <li>• Increase of carbon emissions as a result of proposed project.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Biological Resources</u></b> (Section 4.3)</p>	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential impacts to wildlife habitat.</li> <li>• Impacts to jurisdictional waters.</li> <li>• Impacts to Swainson’s hawk, including Swainson’s hawk nesting and foraging habitat.</li> <li>• Impacts to western pond turtle.</li> <li>• Project consistency with the Yolo County Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Cultural Resources</u></b> (Section 4.4)</p>	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts to archeological resources.</li> <li>• Impacts to historical context of East Olive Drive.</li> <li>• Proposed project within the aboriginal territories of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</u></b> (Section 4.5)</p>	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project construction resulting in potential hazardous waste infiltration into groundwater.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Hydrology and Water Quality</u></b> (Section 4.6)</p>	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water conservation issues.</li> <li>• Impacts related to water usage due to project development.</li> <li>• Flooding impacts as a result of the proposed project.</li> <li>• Impacts resulting in groundwater discharge and dewatering.</li> <li>• Implementation of Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan.</li> <li>• Threats to water quality resulting from project construction.</li> <li>• Post-project hydraulic flows exceeding pre-project flows.</li> </ul>

<p><b><u>Land Use and Planning</u></b> (Section 4.7)</p>	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of open space.</li> <li>• Compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods.</li> <li>• County land use policy considerations.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Noise</u></b> (Section 4.8)</p>	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Train tracks nearby could impact noise levels.</li> <li>• Potential noise impacts from the proposed project.</li> <li>• Construction noise would affect nearby wildlife habitat.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Population and Housing</u></b> (Section 4.9)</p>	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential impacts related to affordable housing and the reduced housing density.</li> <li>• Targeted market rate would be too expensive for students.</li> <li>• Non-residents should be able to rent, not just students.</li> <li>• Potential privacy concerns of other nearby housing.</li> <li>• Senior and low-income population impacted by proposed project.</li> <li>• Increase of visitors to proposed project site.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Transportation and Circulation</u></b> (Section 4.11)</p>	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased traffic as a result of proposed project.</li> <li>• Degradation of existing roads surrounding the project.</li> <li>• Impacts to emergency access routes as a result of increased traffic; gridlock.</li> <li>• Increase in traffic at Olive Drive/Richards Boulevard intersection.</li> <li>• Lack of bicycle path connections to Class I bike path along County Road 32A.</li> <li>• Alternate routes for pedestrians and bicycles.</li> <li>• Potential impacts to the State Highway System and local roadway intersections.</li> <li>• Potential impacts to bicycle and pedestrian mobility and connectivity to nearby trails.</li> <li>• Insufficient parking.</li> <li>• Increase of visiting cars to proposed project site.</li> <li>• Reevaluate possibilities of access to a tunnel between 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and Olive Drive.</li> <li>• A grade for crossing over or under railroad tracks must be developed.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Utilities and Service Systems</u></b> (Section 4.12)</p>	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve surface of East Olive Drive for bicycles and cars.</li> </ul>
<p><b><u>Statutorily Required Sections</u></b> (Chapter 5)</p>	<p>Concerns related to the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growth-inducement.</li> <li>• Cumulative energy impacts.</li> <li>• Significant irreversible changes to the environment.</li> </ul>

<p><b><u>Alternatives</u></b>  <b>(Chapter 6)</b></p>	<p>Concerns related to the following issues;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced parking alternative.</li> <li>• Use of the site as parking for Downtown area and Amtrak station.</li> <li>• Medium-density affordable housing alternative.</li> <li>• Reduced size alternative.</li> </ul>
---	--

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

## **1.7 ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR**

---

The Lincoln40 Project EIR is organized into the following sections:

### **Chapter 1 – Introduction**

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

### **Chapter 2 – Executive Summary**

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

### **Chapter 3 – Project Description**

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

### **Chapter 4 – Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation**

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

### **Chapter 5 – Statutorily Required Sections**

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

### **Chapter 6 – Alternatives Analysis**

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

**Chapter 7 – EIR Authors and Persons Consulted**

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

**Chapter 8 – References**

Provides bibliographic information for all references and resources cited.

**Appendices**

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