2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The Executive Summary chapter of the EIR provides an overview of the Lincoln40 Project (proposed project) and summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis provided in Sections 4.1 through 4.12. In addition, the chapter outlines the mitigation monitoring and reporting program, summarizes the alternatives to the proposed project that are described in the Alternatives Analysis chapter, identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative, and discusses areas of controversy and issues to be resolved. Table 2-1, found at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the environmental effects of the proposed project, as identified in each technical section of the EIR. Table 2-1 also contains the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, the significance of the impacts, the proposed mitigation measures for the impacts, and the significance of the impacts after implementation of the mitigation measures.

2.2 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed 5.92-acre infill 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 site is bisected by Hickory Lane. The project site and general vicinity are within the East Olive Drive sub-area of the City's Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan. Surrounding development includes the Lexington Apartments, the Arbors Apartments, Cesar Chavez Plaza, and a self-storage facility located east of the site, commercial developments and a mobile home park to the west of the project site, and medium density residential developments and automotive uses to the east of the project site. A chainlink fence, installed by the UPRR, separates the project site from the tracks. Beyond the railway is the Old East Davis community, which contains a mix of residential and commercial uses. PG&E's Davis substation (236 K Street) is located north of the project site, across the UPRR tracks. I-80 is located to the east of the site.

The proposed project is a residential in-fill project that would include the demolition of the existing apartment complex and ten single-family homes and the construction of a 249,788-square foot (sf) multi-family residential building as well as parking areas and various amenities. The building would include three tiers, which would step up in height from Olive Drive. The first tier (closest to Olive Drive) would be three stories, the second would be four stories, and the third (closest to the UPRR tracks) 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, and will be designed specifically as off-campus student housing.

The proposed project includes the following components: Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Land Use and Zoning Plan Amendment, Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Zoning Text

Amendments, Project Individualized Program for Affordable Housing, Parcels Merger, Development Agreement, abandonment of Hickory Lane as a public right-of-way and subsequent re-use of Hickory Lane as a private driveway to access the proposed development, design review for site plan and architectural review, and tree modification and/or removal permits for any trimming, modification or removal of trees protected under Chapter 37 of the City of Davis Municipal Code.

In addition, the project would require a demolition permit from the City of Davis for demolition of on-site structures, air quality permits from the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District, and coverage under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System through the Storm Water Pollution Prevention permitting program of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board.

2.3 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Section 15097 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires all State and local agencies to establish monitoring or reporting programs for projects approved by a public agency whenever approval involves the adoption of environmental findings related to environmental impact reports (see Guidelines Section 15091 for Findings). In order to ensure that the mitigation measures and project revisions identified in the EIR are implemented, the public agency shall adopt a program for monitoring or reporting on the revisions which it has required in the project and the measures it has imposed to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects. A public agency may delegate reporting or monitoring responsibilities to another public agency or to a private entity which accepts the delegation; however, until mitigation measures have been completed the lead agency remains responsible for ensuring that implementation of the mitigation measures occurs in accordance with the program.

Consistent with CEQA Section 15097, implementation of the proposed project would require adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) by the City of Davis. The MMRP specifies the methods for monitoring mitigation measures required to eliminate or reduce the project's significant effects on the environment.

2.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND REQUIRED MITIGATION MEASURES

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a significant effect on the environment is defined as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the existing physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, mineral, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. Mitigation measures must be implemented as part of the proposed project to reduce potential adverse impacts to a less-than-significant level. Such mitigation measures are noted in this EIR and the Initial Study (Appendix B) and are found in the following chapters of this EIR: Introduction (Initial Study mitigation measure for Geology and Soils); Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, and Transportation and Circulation. The proposed project would not result in any significant impacts that could not be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigations

imposed by the City. As such, significant and unavoidable impacts would not occur as a result of the proposed project.

A summary of the identified impacts in the technical sections of the EIR is presented in Table 2-1. In Table 2-1, the proposed project impacts are identified for each technical section of Chapter 4 (Sections 4.1 through 4.12) of the EIR. In addition, Table 2-1 includes the level of significance of each impact, any mitigation measures required for each impact, and the resulting level of significance after implementation of mitigation measures for each impact.

2.5 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

This section presents a summary of the alternatives considered for the proposed project, which include the following:

- No Project Alternative;
- Existing Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Alternative;
- Conventional Apartments Alternative;
- Reduced Density Student Apartments Alternative;
- Aggressive Transportation and Parking Demand Management Alternative;
- Mixed-Use Alternative;
- Off-Site (3820 Chiles Road) Alternative;
- Off-Site Woodland Alternative; and
- Off-Site UC Davis On-Campus Alternative

The following summary provides brief descriptions of the eight alternatives to the proposed project that are evaluated in this EIR. In addition, the summary explains the alternatives relative to the objectives for the proposed project (see Chapter 3, Project Description, for a list of the project objectives). For a more thorough discussion of project alternatives, please refer to Chapter 6, Alternatives Analysis.

Summary of No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative is defined as the continuation of the existing condition of the project site at the time of issuance of the Notice of Preparation (NOP), which includes six occupied single-family homes, one vacant single-family home, three uninhabitable single-family homes, and a fully-occupied 14-unit apartment complex.

Because the No Project Alternative would not involve construction, impacts associated with construction of the proposed project would not occur. Furthermore, existing on-site land uses would not be modified as a result of the placement of new residential structures. Overall, the No Project Alternative would result in no impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, and hazards and hazardous materials, and fewer impacts to air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, hydrology and water quality, noise, and transportation and circulation.

However, because the No Project Alternative would not provide housing for students currently residing in the City, revitalize the proposed project site, provide residents with a range of amenities,

encourage the use of alternative forms of transportation, or incorporate sustainable design strategies, the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the basic project objectives (see Chapter 3, Project Description).

Summary of Existing Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Alternative

The No Project Alternative would be considered a "no build" alternative, wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained. However, failure to proceed with the proposed project would not necessarily result in the preservation of the existing environmental conditions, but could rather result in the future buildout of the site pursuant to existing City planning documents. As such, the Existing Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Alternative would be considered another type of "no project" alternative.

Under the Existing Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Alternative, the project site is assumed to be redeveloped pursuant to the current Specific Plan land use assumptions for the project site. The project site is an in-fill site located within the East Olive Drive sub-area of the Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan. Buildout of the project site pursuant to the Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan could be expected to result in the development of 49 new single-family, detached, cottage-style units and 8,000 square feet of commercial space on the project site. It is assumed that the existing on-site residential uses would remain; thus, a total of 73 dwelling units would be on-site under the Existing Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Alternative. Because the Existing Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Alternative would not include student-oriented housing, the Alternative would only have the potential to meet one of the project objectives (related to encouraging the use of alternate forms of transportation).

As discussed in greater detail in Chapter 6 of this EIR, the Existing Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Alternative would result in fewer impacts than the proposed project in the majority of environmental resource areas evaluated in this EIR. However, the Existing Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Alternative would result in greater impacts than the proposed project related to transportation and circulation and similar impacts related to noise.

Summary of Conventional Apartments Alternative

Under the Conventional Apartments Alternative, the project site would be redeveloped similar to the proposed project with 130 units, but with conventional apartments leased by unit, rather than student-oriented apartments with the option to lease by bedroom. The Conventional Apartment Alternative would include affordable housing consistent with the full affordable housing requirements set forth in Section 18.05.060 of the City's Municipal Code. The affordable housing component would also be a conventional plan with the full affordable requirement provided as affordable apartments integrated with the market-rate units. Demolition of the existing structures on the project site would occur, similar to the proposed project, under the Conventional Apartments Alternative. Parking would be provided consistent with City of Davis Municipal Code Section 40.25.090.

The Conventional Apartments Alternative would include a similar range of amenities as the proposed project. In addition, similar to the proposed project, the Conventional Apartments

Alternative would be designed consistent with LEED Gold certification standards. Accordingly, the Conventional Apartments Alternative would be capable of generally meeting all of the five project objectives; however, because the Conventional Apartments Alternative would not provide a student-oriented housing apartment community with a mix of units including up to five-bedroom units, the Alternative would only partially meet one of the five project objectives.

Because the Conventional Apartments Alternative would include demolition of existing on-site structures, a similar area of disturbance as the proposed project, and redevelopment of the project site similar to that of the proposed project, the same mitigation measures identified in the technical sections of this EIR would apply to the Conventional Apartments Alternative. Overall, the Conventional Apartments Alternative would result in slightly fewer impacts related to transportation and circulation than the proposed project; however, impacts related to the remaining environmental resource areas addressed in this EIR would be relatively similar.

Summary of Reduced Density Student Apartments Alternative

The Reduced Density Student Apartments Alternative would maintain the project as student-oriented apartments, but with a reduced number of units. The Reduced Density Student Apartments Alternative would involve development of the site with 100 student apartment units (an approximately 23 percent reduction in the number of proposed units). The Reduced Density Student Apartments Alternative could include affordable housing consistent with the full affordable housing requirements set forth in Section 18.05.060 of the City's Municipal Code. Pursuant to Section 18.05.060(4), the developer can request a project individualized affordable housing plan "that is determined to generate an amount of affordability equal to or greater than the amount that would be generated under the standard affordability requirements."

Similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Density Student Apartments Alternative would include a mix of two-bedroom to five-bedroom furnished living units. The building would be three- to four-stories tall, for a maximum height of 50 feet. The Reduced Density Student Apartments Alternative would include the same amenities as the proposed project. In addition, similar to the proposed project, the Reduced Density Student Apartments Alternative would be designed consistent with LEED Gold certification standards. Because the Reduced Density Student Apartments Alternative would not involve development of up to five stories, the Alternative would only partially meet one of the five project objectives; however, the Reduced Density Student Apartments Alternative would meet all of the other project objectives.

Demolition of existing on-site structures would still occur, albeit the area of disturbance during construction of the Reduced Density Student Apartments Alternative could be slightly less than that which would occur with the proposed project. Overall, the Reduced Density Student Apartments Alternative would result in similar or slightly reduced impacts related to air quality and GHG, biological and cultural resources, and hydrology and water quality. Given the reduction in trips, the Alternative would have a reduced impact to transportation and circulation than the proposed project. Impacts related to the remaining environmental resource areas addressed in this EIR would be relatively similar.

Summary of Aggressive Transportation and Parking Demand Management Alternative

The Aggressive Transportation and Parking Demand Management Alternative would involve development of the site similar to the proposed project, but with fewer parking spaces. Demolition of the existing structures on the project site would occur, similar to the proposed project, under the Aggressive Transportation and Parking Demand Management Alternative. The only difference from the proposed project would be to impose restrictions on parking in order to aggressively discourage the use of single-occupancy vehicles and reduce vehicle miles traveled associated with future residents at the site. Because the Aggressive Transportation and Parking Demand Management Alternative would involve similar development of the project site as the proposed project, with only fewer parking spaces, the Aggressive Transportation and Parking Demand Management Alternative would meet all of the project objectives.

Demolition of existing on-site structures would still occur, and the Aggressive Transportation and Parking Demand Management Alternative would redevelop the site similar to the proposed project with 130 residential units. However, the number of parking spaces would be reduced by 190 spaces, which could allow for the incorporation of more green space areas within the project site than the proposed project. Accordingly, the area of disturbance under the Aggressive Transportation and Parking Demand Management Alternative would be less than what is anticipated for the proposed project. As a result, the significant impacts identified for the proposed project related to air quality and GHG emissions, biological resources, cultural resources, and hydrology and water quality would be reduced under the Aggressive Transportation and Parking Demand Management Alternative. In addition, the Aggressive Transportation and Parking Demand Management Alternative would result in fewer vehicle trips on the surrounding roadway network than the proposed project, which would correlate to a decreased delay to nearby intersections and/or freeway off-ramps compared to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts associated with transportation and circulation would be fewer under the Aggressive Transportation and Parking Demand Management Alternative compared to the proposed project. Impacts related to the remaining environmental resource areas addressed in this EIR would be relatively similar to the proposed project.

Summary of Mixed-Use Alternative

The Mixed-Use Alternative would include a ground floor for retail uses and four stories with 100 student-oriented apartments. Similar to the proposed project, the Mixed-Use Alternative would include a mix of two-bedroom to five-bedroom furnished living units with a building two- to five-stories tall, for a maximum height of approximately 60 feet. The ground-floor retail would consist of approximately 40,000 square feet for retail, which, for analysis purposes, is assumed to consist of 10,000 square feet for restaurant and/or coffee shop space and 30,000 square feet for specialty retail (e.g., salon, fitness, real estate office, florist, apparel, etc.). The Mixed-Use Alternative would include the same residential amenities as the proposed project. In addition, similar to the proposed project, the Mixed-Use Alternative would be designed consistent with LEED Gold certification standards. Accordingly, the Mixed-Use Alternative would be capable of meeting all of the five project objectives. Demolition of the existing structures on the project site would occur, similar to the proposed project, under the Mixed-Use Alternative.

Based on the analysis included in Chapter 6 of this EIR, the Mixed-Use Alternative was determined to result in similar impacts related to air quality and GHG emissions, biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, and hydrology and water quality. However, the impact related to transportation and circulation was determined to be greater under the Mixed-Use Alternative in comparison to the proposed project. The noise impacts under this Alternative were determined to be similar or slightly increased as compared to the proposed project.

Summary of Off-Site (3820 Chiles Road) Alternative

The Off-Site (3820 Chiles Road) Alternative would involve development similar to the proposed project at an off-site location. For the purposes of evaluating an off-site alternative location within the City, City staff has identified a 7.4-acre property located at 3820 Chiles Road. The property currently contains an existing UC Davis office building and associated parking lot. Existing uses surrounding the property include commercial, as well as multi-family and single-family residential. The property faces I-80 directly to the north. The 3820 Chiles Road property is currently zoned Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) and does not currently allow residential uses. Accordingly, development of the Off-Site (3820 Chiles Road) Alternative would require a rezone to allow for the multi-family residential use, as well as design review for site plan and architectural review.

Due to the greater lot acreage, the Off-Site (3820 Chiles Road) Alternative would involve development of a greater number of units than the proposed project (i.e., 163 versus 130). Similar to the proposed project, the Off-Site (3820 Chiles Road) Alternative would include a mix of two-bedroom to five-bedroom furnished student apartments with a building three- to five-stories tall, for a maximum height of 60 feet. Demolition of the existing structures on the 3820 Chiles Road property would occur under the Alternative.

Because the Off-Site (3820 Chiles Road) Alternative would involve similar student-oriented development as the proposed project, the Alternative would meet the majority of the project objectives. However, opportunities for alternate forms of transportation, such as public transit, walking, and bicycling, to such destinations would be less convenient under the Alternative than the proposed project. Because the Alternative would not provide easy access to UC Davis and would not be located on a property that would encourage and/or support the use of alternate forms of transportation to both Downtown Davis and the UC Davis campus, the Off-Site (3820 Chiles Road) Alternative would only partially meet the two project objectives related to such. In addition, because the Off-Site (3820 Chiles Road) Alternative would not involve revitalizing an underutilized tract of land along East Olive Drive, the Alternative would only partially meet the project objective related to such.

Because the Off-Site (3820 Chiles Road) Alternative would not include removal of existing oak trees or other trees of significance, Mitigation Measure 4.3-7(b) would not be required. In addition, the impact identified for the proposed project related to interior noise associated with nearby railroad activity would not occur under the Off-Site (3820 Chiles Road) Alternative and Mitigation Measure 4.8-5 would not be required. Overall, the Off-Site (3820 Chiles Road) Alternative would result in fewer impacts related to biological resources, cultural resources, and noise than the proposed project. Impacts related to air quality and GHG emissions, hydrology and water quality,

and transportation and circulation were determined to be greater than the proposed project under the Off-Site (3820 Chiles Road) Alternative, and impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be expected to be similar.

Summary of Off-Site Woodland Alternative

The Off-Site Woodland Alternative would involve development similar to the proposed project at an off-site location within the City of Woodland. The same number of units, mix of unit type, layout, and building design are anticipated to occur under the Off-Site Woodland Alternative, as compared to the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, the Off-Site Woodland Alternative would include a mix of two-bedroom to five-bedroom furnished student apartments with a building from three- to five-stories tall, for a maximum height of 60 feet. Parking would be provided consistent with City of Woodland standards. The Off-Site Woodland Alternative would include the same amenities as the proposed project. In addition, similar to the proposed project, the Off-Site Woodland Alternative would be designed consistent with LEED Gold certification standards. A particular parcel has not been identified at this time for the Off-Site Woodland Alternative; however, demolition is assumed to be necessary for the Alternative for analysis purposes.

Because the Off-Site Woodland Alternative would involve similar development as the proposed project, the Alternative would meet the majority of the project objectives. However, although a particular parcel has not been identified at this time for the Off-Site Woodland Alternative, it can be reasonably concluded that any location within the jurisdictional boundaries of the City of Woodland would be located further from the UC Davis campus than the proposed project site. As such, the likelihood for students to bike or walk to UC Davis would be much less under the Alternative than the proposed project. Transit ridership may, however, increase under the Alternative. Because the Alternative would not provide easy access to UC Davis and would not be located on a property that would encourage and/or support the use of alternate forms of transportation to both Downtown Davis and the UC Davis campus, the Off-Site Woodland Alternative would only partially meet the two project objectives related to such. In addition, because the Off-Site Woodland Alternative would not involve revitalizing an underutilized tract of land along East Olive Drive, the Alternative would not meet the objective related to such.

According to the analysis included in Chapter 6 of this EIR, the Off-Site Woodland Alternative was determined to result in fewer impacts than the proposed project related to cultural resources and noise; however, impacts related to transportation and circulation were determined to be greater. Impacts related to all remaining environmental resource areas evaluated in this EIR were determined to be similar under the Off-Site Woodland Alternative in comparison to the proposed project.

Summary of Off-Site UC Davis On-Campus Alternative

The Off-Site UC Davis On-Campus Alternative would involve development similar to the proposed project (i.e., 130 student-oriented units with 708 total beds) at an off-site location within the UC Davis campus. Similar to the proposed project, the Off-Site UC Davis On-Campus Alternative would include a mix of two-bedroom to five-bedroom furnished student apartments

with a building two- to five-stories tall, for a maximum height of approximately 60 feet. The Off-Site UC Davis On-Campus Alternative is assumed to include the same amenities as the proposed project, and would be designed consistent with LEED Gold certification standards. An exact site to accommodate the Off-Site UC Davis On-Campus Alternative cannot be specified at this time; however, a reasonable assumption has been made that a similar project could be accommodated if UC Davis chose to do so. Although a particular site has not been identified at this time for the Off-Site UC Davis On-Campus Alternative, the overall area of disturbance that would occur during construction is assumed to be similar to the proposed project for analysis purposes. Based on a review of conceptual Long Range Development Plan land use exhibits for the UC Davis campus, demolition of existing structures may be required in order to implement the Off-Site UC Davis On-Campus Alternative. For analysis purposes, demolition is assumed to be possible for the Alternative. It should be noted that the City of Davis and UC Davis have separate jurisdictions and, thus, development on the UC Davis campus is not regulated by the City of Davis.

Because Off-Site UC Davis On-Campus Alternative would involve similar development as the proposed project on the UC Davis campus and in close proximity to downtown Davis, the Alternative would meet the majority of the project objectives. However, because the Off-Site UC Davis On-Campus Alternative would not involve revitalizing an underutilized tract of land along East Olive Drive, the Alternative would only partially meet the project objective related to such.

Based on the analysis included in Chapter 6 of this EIR, the Off-Site UC Davis On-Campus Alternative was determined to result in fewer impacts than the proposed project related to biological resources and transportation and circulation; however, impacts related to all remaining environmental resource areas evaluated in this EIR were determined to be similar under the Off-Site UC Davis On-Campus Alternative in comparison to the proposed project.

2.6 Environmentally Superior Alternative

An EIR is required to identify the environmentally superior alternative from among the range of reasonable alternatives that are evaluated. Section 15126(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an environmentally superior alternative be designated and states, "If the environmentally superior alternative is the 'no project' alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives." All of the significant impacts identified for the proposed project would not occur or would be fewer under the No Project Alternative. Thus, the No Project Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative. In addition, the Existing Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Alternative would reduce the majority of significant impacts identified for the proposed project compared to the remaining project alternatives. However, given that a "no project" alternative shall not be selected as the environmentally superior alternative, the No Project Alternative nor the Existing Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan Alternative (i.e, a variation of the no project alternative) may be chosen as the environmentally superior alternative, and the environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives should be chosen.

As discussed in Chapter 6 of this EIR, the Aggressive Transportation and Parking Demand Management Alternative would result in the most reductions of significant impacts identified for the proposed project compared to the remaining project alternatives. It is noted, however, that the

Reduced Density Student Apartments Alternative would have the potential to reduce project impacts in a similar number of categories as the Aggressive Transportation and Parking Demand Management Alternative. However, given that the Aggressive Transportation and Parking Demand Alternative would more clearly result in reduced on-site disturbance area due to the substantial reduction in parking spaces, it is concluded that the Aggressive Transportation and Parking Demand Management Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project.

2.7 Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved

The CEQA Guidelines, Section 15123(b), require that this EIR consider areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. Areas of controversy that were identified in NOP comment letters and verbal comments received at the public scoping meeting held on September 15, 2016 include the following:

- Impeding natural views from increased height and volume of development on the project site;
- Impacts to air quality;
- Retention of open space;
- Provision of affordable housing;
- Removal of on-site trees that could provide suitable habitat for wildlife;
- Impacts to on-site cork oaks;
- Impacts related to multimodal travel demand; and
- Connectivity between the project site and Downtown Davis

All of the above issues are addressed in this EIR in the relevant chapters.

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources				
4.1-1	**Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.1-2	**Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.**	LS	*None Required.*	N/A
4.1-3	**Create a substantial shadow effect on shadow-sensitive use areas (where sunlight is important to its function).**	LS	*None Required.*	N/A
4.1-4	**Long-term changes in visual character of the region associated with cumulative development of the proposed project in combination with future buildout in the City of Davis.**	LCC	*None Required.*	N/A
4.1-5	**Cumulative impacts related to the creation of**	LCC	*None Required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	new sources of light or glare associated with development of the proposed project in combination with future buildout in the City of Davis.			
	4.2 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
4.2-1	**Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation during construction.**	LS	*None Required.*	N/A
4.2-2	**Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation during operations, and a conflict with or obstruction of implementation of applicable air quality plans.**	LS	*None Required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.2-3	**Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.**	S	*4.2-3*	*Prior to approval of any grading plans, the project applicant shall show on the plans via notation that the contractor shall ensure that all diesel-powered equipment (e.g., rubber-tired dozers, scrapers, cranes, etc.) to be used in the construction of the project (including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles) shall, at a minimum, meet USEPA emissions standards for Tier 4 engines or equivalent. The plans shall be submitted for review and approval to the Department of Community Development and Sustainability.*	LS
4.2-4	**Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.**	LS	*None Required.*		N/A
4.2-5	**Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative**	LCC	*None Required.*		N/A

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	thresholds for ozone precursors).			
4.2-6	**Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.**	LCC	*None Required.*	N/A
4.2-7	**Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.**	LCC	*None Required.*	N/A
	4.3 Biological Resources			
4.3-1	**Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on Swainson's hawk.**	S	*4.3-1(a)* *For construction activities occurring between February 1 and August 31, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct surveys for Swainson's hawk in accordance with the Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee 2000 guidelines (SHTAC 2000) or currently accepted guidance/industry standards, subject to review and approval by the Department of Community Development and Sustainability. Surveys shall encompass a 0.25-mile minimum radius around the construction area. If Swainson's hawk and/or Swainson's hawk nests are not*	LS

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		observed during the survey, further mitigation is not required. If nesting Swainson's hawks are detected, a 0.25-mile, no-disturbance buffer should be established, depending on location. The buffer shall be maintained until a qualified biologist has determined that the young have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival. The buffer distance may be reduced in consultation with CDFW and the Department of Community Development and Sustainability if an adequate visual buffer exists between the construction and an active nest, and if the nesting pair is not disturbed by the noise and activity on the construction site. This is done on a case-by-case basis if a nest has been established prior to or during construction. *4.3-1(b)* *If an active Swainson's hawk nest is found within the project site and the nesting tree is to be removed during construction activities, removal shall take place only after (1) the qualified biologist has determined that the young have fledged (typically by August 31st) and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival, and (2) outside of the Swainson's hawk nesting season (February 1 to August 31). If any nesting tree is removed, a tree*	

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		replacement plan shall be prepared, in consultation with CDFW and the Department of Community Development and Sustainability, to replace the nest trees. The tree replacement plan shall require the nesting tree(s) be replaced on a 1:1 basis and planted at an on-site or off-site location selected by the project applicant in consultation with CDFW and the Department of Community Development and Sustainability. The tree replacement plan shall also require that a qualified biologist monitor any replacement trees on an annual basis for five years to ensure the survivability of replacement trees. Results of the monitoring shall be submitted to the Department of Community Development and Sustainability for review and approval.	
4.3-2 Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on burrowing owl.	S	*4.3-2(a)* *The project applicant shall implement the following measures to avoid or minimize impacts to western burrowing owl:* • *No more than 14 days prior to initiation of ground disturbing activities, the project applicant shall retain a qualified burrowing owl biologist to conduct a take avoidance survey of the proposed project site, any off-site improvement areas, and all publicly accessible potential burrowing owl habitat*	LS

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		within 500 feet of the project construction footprint. The survey shall be performed in accordance with the applicable sections of the March 7, 2012, CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation guidelines. If the survey does not identify any nesting burrowing owls on the proposed project site, further mitigation is not required. The take avoidance survey shall be submitted to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability for review. The survey periods and number of surveys are identified below: o *If construction related activities commence during the non-breeding season (1 September to 31 January), a minimum of one take avoidance survey shall be conducted of that phase and all publicly accessible potential burrowing owl habitat within 500 feet of the construction footprint of that phase.* o *If construction related activities commence during the early breeding season (1 February to 15 April), a minimum of one take avoidance survey shall be conducted of that phase and all*	

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		publicly accessible potential burrowing owl habitat within 500 feet of the construction footprint of that phase. o *If construction related activities commence during the breeding season (16 April to 30 August), a minimum of three take avoidance surveys shall be conducted of that phase and all publicly accessible potential burrowing owl habitat within 500 feet of the construction footprint of that phase. If construction related activities commence after 15 June, at least one of the three surveys shall be completed after 15 June.* o *Because the owls are known to occur nearby and may take up occupancy on a site under construction, the take avoidance survey shall be conducted prior to the start of any new phase, and/or if construction-related activity is delayed or suspended for more than 30 days.* • *If active burrowing owl dens are found within the survey area in an area where disturbance would occur, the project applicant shall*	

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		implement measures consistent with the applicable portions of the March 7, 2012, CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation guidelines. If needed, as determined by the biologist, the formulation of avoidance and minimization approaches would be developed in coordination with the CDFW. The avoidance and minimization approaches would likely include burrow avoidance buffers during the nesting season (February to August). For burrowing owls present on-site, outside of the nesting season, passive exclusion of owls from the burrows could be utilized under a CDFW-approved burrow exclusion plan. *4.3-2(b)* *If active owl burrows are present and the project would impact active burrows, the project applicant shall provide compensatory mitigation for the permanent loss of burrowing owl habitat at a ratio of 2.5 acres of higher quality owl habitat for every one acre of suitable owl habitat disturbed. The calculation of habitat loss may exclude acres currently occupied by hardscape or structures. Such mitigation may include the permanent protection of land that is deemed to be suitable burrowing owl*	

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
				habitat through a conservation easement deeded to a non-profit conservation organization or public agency with a conservation mission, or the purchase of burrowing owl conservation bank credits from a CDFW-approved burrowing owl conservation bank. A record of the compensatory mitigation provided by the project applicant shall be submitted to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability prior to initiation of ground disturbing activities.	
4.3-3	**Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on raptors, nesting birds, or other birds protected under the MBTA.**	S	*4.3-3*	*The project applicant shall implement the following measures to avoid or minimize impacts to white-tailed kite, other raptors, and protected migratory bird species:* • *If any site disturbance or construction activity for any phase of development begins outside the February 1 to August 31 breeding season, a preconstruction survey for active nests shall not be required.* • *If any site disturbance or construction activity for any phase of development is scheduled to begin between February 1 and August 31, a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for active nests from publicly accessible areas within 14 days prior*	LS

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		site disturbance or construction activity for any phase of development. The survey area shall cover the construction site and the area surrounding the construction site, including a 100-foot radius for MBTA birds, and a 500-foot radius for birds of prey. If an active nest of a bird of prey, MBTA bird, or other protected bird is not found, then further mitigation measures are not necessary. The preconstruction survey shall be submitted to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability for review. • *If an active nest of a bird of prey, MBTA bird, or other protected bird is discovered that may be adversely affected by any site disturbance or construction or an injured or killed bird is found, the project applicant shall immediately:* o *Stop all work within a 100-foot radius of the discovery.* o *Notify the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability.* o *Do not resume work within the 100-foot radius until authorized by the biologist.*	

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		o *The biologist shall establish a minimum 500-foot Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA) around the nest if the nest is of a bird of prey, and a minimum 100-foot ESA around the nest if the nest is of an MBTA bird other than a bird of prey. The ESA may be reduced if the biologist determines that a smaller ESA would still adequately protect the active nest. Further work may not occur within the ESA until the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active.*	
4.3-4 Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on special-status bats.	S	*4.3-4 Before ground disturbance is initiated, a qualified biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment survey to determine whether the removal of trees greater than 10 inches in diameter at breast height (DBH) support bat roosts. Trees shall be surveyed within 14 days before the onset of construction. Surveys shall consist of daytime pedestrian surveys looking for potential roosting habitat such as branch and bole hollows, exfoliating bark and other crevices and cavities, and may include an evening emergence survey with acoustic equipment to note the presence or absence of bats. The emergence survey is necessary to survey for foliage-roosting bat species (western red bat and hoary bat). The*	LS

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		three special-status bat species potentially occurring on the site should be identifiable utilizing acoustic equipment. *If bats are not acoustically detected and potential roosting habitat is not identified, then further study and mitigation is not required. If evidence of bat use is detected, the biologist shall determine the approximate number and species of bats using the roost, and roost type (i.e., individual or maternity roost). A 100-foot buffer shall be created around the roost and project-related activities shall not occur within the buffer until after one of the steps below is performed:* • *A qualified biologist has determined that the roost is no longer in use.* • *A qualified biologist determines that bat exclusion is feasible and confirms that all bats have been excluded from the daytime roost. Bat exclusion shall not occur between April 1 and September 15 (depending on type of roost and location), which coincides with the maternity season in California.* • *Trees that potentially support active roosts have been removed. However, if bat roosts are*	

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		detected on the project site, trees shall not be removed from April 1 to September 15 in order to avoid the maternity season. Subject to monitoring by a qualified biologist, trees that potentially support active roosts may be removed outside of the maternity season using procedures that create noise and cause vibration, which are designed to cause bats to leave potential roosts. *Results of the habitat assessment survey shall be submitted to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability for review.*	
4.3-5 Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the CWA (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.3-6	**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.**	LS	*None required.*		N/A
4.3-7	**Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.**	S	*4.3-7(a)*	*The project applicant shall implement the following tree preservation measures prior to and during construction for all trees to be preserved on the proposed project site:* • *Tree Protection Zones (TPZs): The surveyed trunk locations and TPZs / tree protection fencing shall be indicated on all construction plans for trees to be preserved;* • *Modified TPZs: Modified TPZs are areas where proposed infrastructure is located within protection zones. These Modified TPZs and fencing shall be indicated as close to infrastructure as possible (minimize overbuild);* • *The Consulting Arborist shall revise*	LS

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		development impact assessment (as needed) for trees to be preserved once construction plans are drafted; • *Grading, compaction, trenching, rototilling, vehicle traffic, material storage, spoil, waste, or washout, or any other disturbance within TPZs shall be avoided to the maximum extent feasible.* • *Any work that is to occur within the TPZs shall be monitored by the Consulting Arborist;* • *A meeting shall be conducted to discuss tree preservation guidelines with the Consulting Arborist and all contractors, subcontractors, and project managers prior to the initiation of demolition and construction activities;* • *Prior to any demolition activity on-site, tree protection fencing shall be installed in a circle centered at the tree trunk with a radius equal to the defined TPZ as indicated in the Arborist Report;* • *Tree protection fences should be made of chain-link with posts sunk into the ground, and shall not be removed or moved until construction is complete;* • *Any pruning shall be performed per recommendations in the Arborist Report by an*	

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		ISA Certified Arborist or Tree Worker. Pruning for necessary clearance should be the minimum required to build the project and performed prior to demolition by an ISA Certified Arborist; • *If roots larger than 1.5 inches or limbs larger than 3 inches in diameter are cut or damaged during construction, the Consulting Arborist shall be contacted immediately to inspect and recommend appropriate remedial treatments;* • *All trees to be preserved shall be irrigated once every two weeks, spring through fall, to uniformly wet the soil to a depth of at least 18 inches under and beyond the canopies of the trees.* *The tree preservation measures shall be included in the notes on construction drawings.* *4.3-7(b)* *The project applicant shall implement the following tree protection measures prior to and during construction to avoid or minimize impacts to cork oak trees #40 and #41:* • *All work within the protection zones of the trees shall be supervised by the Consulting*	

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Arborist; • *Overbuild for the building is to be limited to the path surrounding the building (use shoring as needed);* • *The grading limits of the building closest to the trunk within the protection zone of tree #40 shall be excavated with water and any roots two inches or larger shall be pre-cut prior to excavation;* • *The TPZ of trees #40 and #41 (except for the grading area) are to be fenced off prior to demolition and through the construction period and protected from soil disturbance;* • *Concrete walkways are to be installed on grade without soil scarification;* • *Walls are to be installed on grade on piers avoiding roots greater than two inches in diameter;* • *A drip irrigation system (emitters on two-foot centers in the Tree Protection Zone where possible) shall be installed under four inches mulch, which shall be maintained at that thickness; and* • *The Consulting Arborist shall inspect the trees throughout the construction period and every spring and summer for at least three years*	

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance after Mitigation
				following the end of construction. The inspections would include an assessment of, and recommendations to improve, tree health, preservation measures, and irrigation management. The results of each inspection shall be submitted to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability. *The tree preservation measures shall be included in the notes on construction drawings.*	
4.3-8	**Conflict with an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.**	S	*4.3-8*	*Should the Yolo Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP) be adopted prior to initiation of any ground disturbing activities for any phase of development associated with the proposed project, the project applicant shall comply with the mitigation/conservation requirements of the Yolo HCP/NCCP, as applicable. The project applicant, the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability, and a representative from the YHC shall ensure that all mitigation/conservation requirements of the HCP/NCCP are adhered to prior to and during construction. To the extent there is duplication in mitigation for a given species, the requirements of the HCP/NCCP shall supersede.*	LS

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.3-9	**Cumulative loss of habitat in the City of Davis area for special-status species.**	LCC	*None required.*		N/A
	4.4 Cultural Resources				
4.4-1	**Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.**	S	*4.4-1*	*If any subsurface historic remains, prehistoric or historic artifacts, other indications of archaeological resources, or cultural and/or tribal resources are found during grading and construction activities, all work within 100 feet of the find shall cease, the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability shall be notified, and the applicant shall retain an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology, as appropriate, to evaluate the find(s). If tribal resources are found during grading and construction activities, the applicant shall notify the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation.* *The archaeologist shall define the physical extent and the nature of any built features or artifact-bearing deposits. The investigation shall proceed immediately into a formal evaluation to determine the eligibility of the feature(s) for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources. The*	LS

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		formal evaluation shall include, at a minimum, additional exposure of the feature(s), photo-documentation and recordation, and analysis of the artifact assemblage(s). If the evaluation determines that the feature(s) and artifact(s) do not have sufficient data potential to be eligible for the California Register, additional work shall not be required. However, if data potential exists (e.g., an intact feature is identified with a large and varied artifact assemblage), further mitigation would be necessary, which might include avoidance of further disturbance to the resource(s) through project redesign. If avoidance is determined to be infeasible, additional data recovery excavations shall be conducted for the resource(s), to collect enough information to exhaust the data potential of those resources. *Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(b)(3)(C), a data recovery plan, which makes provisions for adequately recovering the scientifically consequential information from and about the resource, shall be prepared and adopted prior to any excavation being undertaken. Such studies shall be deposited with the California Historical Resources Regional Information Center.*	

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Data recovery efforts can range from rapid photographic documentation to extensive excavation depending upon the physical nature of the resource. The degree of effort shall be determined at the discretion of a qualified archaeologist and should be sufficient to recover data considered important to the area's history and/or prehistory. *Significance determinations for tribal cultural resources shall be measured in terms of criteria for inclusion on the California Register of Historical Resources (Title 14 CCR, §4852[a]), and the definition of tribal cultural resources set forth in Public Resources Code Section 21074 and 5020.1 (k). The evaluation of the tribal cultural resource(s) shall include culturally appropriate temporary and permanent treatment, which may include avoidance of tribal cultural resources, in-place preservation, and/or re-burial on project property so the resource(s) are not subject to further disturbance in perpetuity. Any re-burial shall occur at a location predetermined between the landowner and the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation. The landowner shall relinquish ownership of all sacred items, burial goods, and all archaeological artifacts that are*	

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance after Mitigation
				found on the project area to the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation for proper treatment and disposition. If an artifact must be removed during project excavation or testing, curation may be an appropriate mitigation. *The language of this mitigation measure shall be included on any future grading plans, utility plans, and subdivision improvement drawings approved by the City for the development of the Lincoln40 project site.*	
4.4-2	**Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.**	S	*4.4-2*	*Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1.*	LS
4.4-3	**Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature on the project site.**	S	*4.4-3*	*If any vertebrate bones or teeth are found by the construction crew, the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability shall be notified and the contractor shall cease all work within 100 feet of the discovery until an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in prehistoric or historical archaeology, as appropriate, inspects the discovery. If deemed*	LS

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
				significant with respect to authenticity, completeness, preservation, and identification, the resource(s) shall then be salvaged and deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution (e.g., the University of California Museum of Paleontology), where it shall be properly curated and preserved for the benefit of current and future generations. The language of this mitigation measure shall be included on any future grading plans, utility plans, and subdivision improvement drawings approved by the City for Lincoln40 project site, where excavation work would be required.	
4.4-4	**Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archeological resource or tribal cultural resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5, Public Resource Code Section 5020.1 (k), or Public Resource Code Section 21074 or disturb any human remains, including those interred**	S	*4.4-4(a)*	*Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-1.*	LS
			4.4-4(b)	*If human remains are discovered during project construction, further disturbance shall not occur within 100 feet of the vicinity of the find(s) until the Yolo County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. (California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5) Further, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98(b), remains shall be left in place and free from disturbance until a final decision as to the treatment and disposition has been made. If the Yolo County Coroner determines the remains to be*	

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	outside of formal cemeteries.			*Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation must be contacted within 24 hours. The NAHC and Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation must then identify the "most likely descendant(s)" (MLD). The landowner shall engage in consultations with the MLD. The MLD shall make recommendations concerning the treatment of the remains within 48 hours, as provided in Public Resources Code 5097.98.*	
4.4-5	**Cumulative development in the City of Davis, in conjunction with the development of the proposed project, could contribute incrementally to the regional loss of cultural resources in the City of Davis.**	LS	*None required.*		N/A
	4.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials				
4.5-1	**Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the**	S	*4.5-1(a)*	*Prior to issuance of a demolition permit by the City for any on-site structures, the project applicant shall provide a site assessment that determines whether any structures to be demolished contain lead-based paint. If structures do not contain lead-based paint, further mitigation is not required. If*	LS

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
release of hazardous materials into the environment.		*lead-based paint is found, all loose and peeling paint shall be removed and disposed of by a licensed and certified lead paint removal contractor, in accordance with federal, State, and local regulations. The demolition contractor shall be informed that all paint on the buildings shall be considered as containing lead. The contractor shall take appropriate precautions to protect his/her workers, the surrounding community, and to dispose of construction waste containing lead paint in accordance with federal, State, and local regulations subject to approval by the City Engineer.* *4.5-1(b)* *Prior to issuance of a demolition permit by the City for any on-site structures, the project applicant shall provide a site assessment that determines whether any structures to be demolished contain asbestos. If structures do not contain asbestos, further mitigation is not required. If asbestos-containing materials are detected, the applicant shall prepare and implement an asbestos abatement plan consistent with federal, State, and local standards, subject to approval by the City Engineer, City Building Official, and the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District.*	

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Implementation of the asbestos abatement plan shall include the removal and disposal of the asbestos-containing materials by a licensed and certified asbestos removal contractor, in accordance with local, State, and federal regulations. In addition, the demolition contractor shall be informed that all building materials shall be considered as containing asbestos. The contractor shall take appropriate precautions to protect his/her workers, the surrounding community, and to dispose of construction waste containing asbestos in accordance with local, State, and federal regulations subject to the City Engineer, City Building Official, and the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District.	
4.5-2 Increase in the number of people who could be exposed to potential hazards or hazardous materials and an increase in the transport, storage, and use of hazardous materials due to development of the proposed project in combination with future	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	buildout in the City of Davis.				
	4.6 Hydrology and Water Quality				
4.6-1	**Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality through erosion during construction.**	S	*4.6-1*	*Prior to initiation of any ground disturbing activities, the project applicant shall prepare a SWPPP, and implement BMPs that comply with the Stormwater Construction General Permit from the RWQCB, to reduce water quality effects during construction. Such BMPs may include but not be limited to: temporary erosion control measures such as silt fences, staked straw bales/wattles, silt/sediment basins and traps, check dams, geofabric, sandbag dikes, watering down disturbed soil during grading activities, suspending grading or dirt disturbing activities during wind events in excess of 25mph, stabilized construction entrances, and temporary revegetation. Other BMPs may include, but be not limited to, good housekeeping practices such as concrete washout facilities, containerizing construction materials, keeping public street front clean of sediments, placing drainage inlet protection on any drainage inlets onsite or downstream of the project site, and having still response kits on-site. The SWPPP shall be kept on-site and implemented during construction activities and shall be made available upon request*	LS

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation		Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
				to representatives of the City of Davis and/or RWQCB.	
4.6-2	**Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality during operations.**	S	*4.6-2*	*Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant shall submit to the City a final plan, identifying permanent stormwater TCMs, SDMs, and Hydromodification Measures, for each DMA to be implemented on the project, as well as a signed stormwater maintenance agreement and corresponding maintenance plan. The plan shall include LID measures consistent with the Lincoln40 Utilities Demand, and the Lincoln40: Drainage Evaluation for 2-Year and 10-Year Events memoranda prepared for the project and shall be subject to review and approval by the Public Works Department.*	LS
4.6-3	**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 preexisting nearby**	LS	*None required.*		N/A

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted).			
4.6-4	**Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, or create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site.**	S	*4.6-4 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.6-2.*	LS
4.6-5	**Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a dam.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.6-6	**Cumulative impacts related to hydrology and water quality within the City of Davis.**	LCC	*None required.*	N/A
4.7 Land Use and Planning				
4.7-1	**Conflict, or create an inconsistency, with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.7-2	**Cumulative land use and planning incompatibilities.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.8 Noise			
4.8-1 A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	S	*4.8-1* *Prior to issuance of any grading permit, the applicant shall submit proposed noise-reduction practices (to ensure individual piece of equipment shall not produce a noise level exceeding 83 dBA at a distance of 25 feet and the noise level at any point outside the property plane of the project shall not exceed 86 dBA), for review and approval by the Department of Community Development and Sustainability. One or more of the following measures shall be utilized to reduce the impact of construction noise (below the above stated single-source and property boundary standards):* • *Electric construction equipment as an alternative to diesel-powered equipment.* • *Sound-control devices on construction equipment.* • *Muffled exhaust on construction equipment.* • *Construction equipment staging and operation setbacks from nearby sensitive receptors.* • *Limits on idling time for construction vehicles and equipment.* • *Installation of acoustic barriers around*	LS

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			stationary construction noise sources. • *Installation of temporary barriers between the project site and adjacent sensitive receptors.*	
4.8-2	**Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.8-3	**Transportation noise impacts to existing sensitive receptors in the project vicinity.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.8-4	**Vehicular traffic noise impacts to new sensitive receptors in the project vicinity.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.8-5	**Railroad noise at new sensitive receptors.**	S	*4.8-5(a) Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall retain an expert acoustical consultant to perform a focused noise analysis to evaluate interior noise levels taking into consideration final building materials, any adjustments to building locations, façade and fenestration improvements, etc. to determine if the final site and building plans would result in interior noise levels with the potential to exceed the standard of 45 dB L_{dn}. The focused noise analysis results shall be submitted for*	LS

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
			review and approval by the Department of Community Development and Sustainability. *4.8-5(b)* *If the final site and building plans result in interior noise levels with the potential to exceed the standard of 45 dB L_{dn} within one or more residential units, then windows facing the railroad tracks for all such residential units shall include appropriately-rated STC windows, as determined by the acoustical consultant.*	
4.8-6	**Railroad noise may increase at residences north of the project site due to reflections of sound off of building facades.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.8-7	**Cumulative impacts on traffic noise-sensitive receptors.**	LCC	*None required.*	N/A
4.8-8	**CEQA Cumulative Alternatives Generated Traffic Noise at Existing Sensitive Receptors.**	LCC	*None required.*	N/A
4.8-9	**Cumulative traffic noise effects on proposed uses.**	LCC	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.9 Population and Housing				
4.9-1	**Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.9-2	**Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people requiring construction of replacement housing elsewhere.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.9-3	**The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on population growth and displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.10 Public Services and Recreation			
4.10-1 Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, and/or the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection facilities.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.10-2 Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities, and/or the need for new	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection facilities.			
4.10-3	**Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered school facilities, and/or the need for new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives for school facilities.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.10-4 Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered park facilities, and/or the need for new or physically altered park facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain performance objectives for park facilities.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.10-5 Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered other public facilities, and/or the need for new or physically altered other public facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for other public facilities.			
4.10-6	**Development of the proposed project, in combination with future buildout in the City of Davis, would increase demand for additional public services, and recreational facilities.**	LCC	*None required.*	N/A
	4.11 Transportation and Circulation			
4.11-1	**Impacts to study intersections under the Existing Plus Project scenario.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.11-2	**Impacts to study freeway segments under the Existing Plus Project scenario**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.11-3	**The project's Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) would exceed local or**	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	regional per capita averages.			
4.11-4	**Impacts to Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.11-5	**Impact to Transit Service.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.11-6	**Impacts to Emergency Vehicle Access.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.11-7	**Impacts associated with Construction Vehicle Traffic.**	S	*4.11-7* *Before commencement of any construction activities for the project site, the project applicant shall prepare a detailed Construction Traffic Control Plan and submit it for review and approval by the City Department of Public Works. The applicant and the City shall consult with Caltrans, Unitrans, Yolobus, and local emergency service providers for their input before approving the Plan. The Plan shall ensure that acceptable operating conditions on local roadways and freeway facilities are maintained during construction. At a minimum, the Plan shall include:* • *The number of truck trips, time, and day of street closures;* • *Time of day of arrival and departure of trucks;*	LS

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		• *Limitations on the size and type of trucks, provision of a staging area with a limitation on the number of trucks that can be waiting;* • *Provision of a truck circulation pattern;* • *Provision of driveway access plan so that safe vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle movements are maintained (e.g., steel plates, minimum distances of open trenches, and private vehicle pick up and drop off areas);* • *Maintain safe and efficient access routes for emergency vehicles;* • *Manual traffic control when necessary;* • *Proper advance warning and posted signage concerning street closures; and* • *Provisions for pedestrian safety.* *A copy of the Construction Traffic Control Plan shall be submitted to local emergency response agencies and these agencies shall be notified at least 14 days before the commencement of construction that would partially or fully obstruct roadways.*	
4.11-8 Impacts to study intersections under the Cumulative Plus Project scenario.	CC	*4.11-8* *Prior to approval of the Lincoln40 Improvement Plans, the plans shall show the extension of the existing westbound Olive Drive bicycle lane an additional 145 feet from its current terminus on East*	LCC

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Olive Drive to the intersection of Richards Boulevard/Olive Drive. The East Olive Drive lane configuration shall include the following as shown in the Exhibit below: • *A westbound bike lane (7 feet);* • *A westbound shared through / right-turn lane (10 feet);* • *A westbound left-turn lane (10 feet);* • *An eastbound travel lane (10 feet); and* • *An eastbound bike lane (7 feet).* *The applicant shall construct the striping improvements prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy. As part of this improvement, the coordinated traffic signals between First Street / D Street and Richards Boulevard / Research Park Drive shall be re-timed to provide efficient traffic flow.*	
4.11-9 Impacts to study freeway segments under the Cumulative Plus Project scenario.	CC	*4.11-9* *Implement Mitigation Measure 4.11-8.*	LCC
4.11-10 Impacts to study intersections under the	LCC	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	CEQA Cumulative scenarios.			
4.11-11	**Impacts to study freeway segments under CEQA Cumulative scenarios.**	LCC	*None required.*	N/A
4.11-12	**The project's Regional Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) would exceed regional per capita averages.**	LCC	*None required.*	N/A
4.11-13	**Cumulative Impacts to Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities.**	LCC	*None required.*	N/A
4.11-14	**Cumulative Impacts to Transit Service.**	LCC	*None required.*	N/A
	4.12 Utilities and Service Systems			
4.12-1	**Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.12-2	**Would the project 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, and that project wastewater would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.12-3	**Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs or fail to comply with federal, State, and local statutes**	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	and regulations related to solid waste.			
4.12-4	**Gas, electric, and telecommunication facilities.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.12-5	**Development of the proposed project, in combination with future buildout in the City of Davis, would increase demand for additional utilities.**	LCC	*None required.*	N/A
	Initial Study			
VI c,d.	**Would the project 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?**	S	*VI-1. The following requirements, identified in the Geotechnical Investigation for the Lincoln40 Project, shall be shown on the project grading and foundation plans, subject to review and approval by the City engineer:* • *Remedial grading in the form of partial removal and re-compaction of soils is required in order to reduce the potential for adverse post-construction settlement and to allow the use of conventional shallow foundations for the proposed buildings.*	LS

TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1B of the Uniform Building Code?		*Specific remedial grading and foundation recommendations are provided in the Geotechnical Investigation.* • *Proper moisture conditioning during site grading (see Geotechnical Report Sections 7.5.10 thru 7.5.13); extending footings below the zone of seasonal moisture fluctuation (i.e., top 18 inches of soil); and placing low-expansive material, such as Class 2 Aggregate Base (AB) below concrete flatwork and other exterior slabs is required.* • *Complete removal of existing structures, foundations, underground utilities, and septic tanks/leach fields (if present).*	