

CEQA requires an EIR to evaluate a project's effects in relationship to broader changes occurring, or that are foreseeable to occur, in the surrounding environment. Accordingly, this chapter presents discussion of CEQA-mandated analysis for cumulative impacts and irreversible impacts associated with the West Davis Active Adult Community Project. As described below, this section also includes an analysis of the project's growth inducing impacts.

4.1 CUMULATIVE SETTING AND IMPACT ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) contain an assessment of the cumulative impacts that could be associated with the proposed project. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a), "an EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable." "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects (as defined by Section 15130). As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15355, a cumulative impact consists of an impact that is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts. A cumulative impact occurs from:

...the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.

In addition, Section 15130(b) identifies that the following three elements are necessary for an adequate cumulative analysis:

- 1) Either:
 - (A) A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency; or,
 - (B) A summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact. Any such planning document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency.
- 2) A summary of the expected environmental effects to be produced by those projects with specific reference to additional information stating where that information is available; and

- 3) A reasonable analysis of the cumulative impacts of the relevant projects. An EIR shall examine reasonable, feasible options for mitigating or avoiding the project's contribution to any significant cumulative effects.

Where a lead agency is examining a project with an incremental effect that is not "cumulatively considerable," a lead agency need not consider that effect significant, but shall briefly describe its basis for concluding that the incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable.

CUMULATIVE SETTING

The cumulative analysis for this EIR is based on the City of Davis General Plan (May 2001) and the Program EIR for the City of Davis General Plan Update and Project EIR for Establishment of a New Junior High School (General Plan Update EIR) (January 2000). In addition to the cumulative growth projections provided by these documents, the cumulative analysis also used the following list of probable future projects within the City of Davis to determine cumulative growth in the area:

- **Paso Fino:** 6 single-family units
- **2860 West Covell Boulevard Building:** 8,657 square feet of retail
- **Grande Subdivision:** 41 single-family units
- **Chiles Ranch:** 96 single-family units
- **University Retirement Community (URC) expansion:** 17 beds of continuing care
- **Sterling Apartments:** 198 multi-family units
- **Cannery Park (Remainder of Buildout):** 86,250 square feet of retail, 49,800 square feet of office, 22,000 square feet of medical-office, 311 single-family dwelling units, and 264 multi-family units.
- **Sutter Hospital Expansion** – Based on discussions with Sutter Davis Hospital representatives, a net increase of 100,000 square feet of medical-office space was assumed on the hospital property, which is located directly east of the project site.
- **UC Davis Long Range Development Plan (LRDP)** – According to the 2017 Notice of Preparation for the update to the LRDP (dated January 4, 2017), the UC Davis campus is assumed to have a net increase of 6,229 students and 2,000 employees between existing conditions and the 2027-2028 academic year. The LRDP NOP makes no mention of further growth beyond the 2027-2028 year.

The cumulative traffic scenarios and assumptions are described in greater detail in Section 3.14. Cumulative project impacts are addressed and summarized below.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS OF THE PROJECT

Method of Analysis

Although the environmental effects of an individual project may not be significant when that project is considered separately, the combined effects of several projects may be significant when considered collectively. State CEQA Guidelines 15130 requires a reasonable analysis of a project's cumulative impacts, which are defined as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." The cumulative impact that results from several closely related projects is: the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonable foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time (State CEQA Guidelines 15355[b]). Consistent with state CEQA Guidelines §15130(a), the discussion of cumulative impacts in this Draft EIR focuses on significant and potentially significant cumulative impacts. According to §15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, in part, "The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness, and should focus on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impact."

The goal of analysis of cumulative impacts is twofold: first, to determine whether the overall long-term impacts of all such projects would be cumulatively significant; and second, to determine whether the proposed project itself would cause a "cumulatively considerable" (and thus significant) incremental contribution to any such cumulatively significant impacts. (See state CEQA Guidelines §§15130[a]-[b], §15355[b], §15064[h], §15065[c]; *Communities for a Better Environment v. California Resources Agency* [2002] 103 Cal.App.4th 98, 120.) In other words, the required analysis first creates a broad context in which to assess the project's incremental contribution to anticipated cumulative impacts, viewed on a geographic scale well beyond the project site itself, and then determines whether the proposed project's incremental contribution to any significant cumulative impacts from all projects is itself significant (i.e., "cumulatively considerable").

There are two approaches to identifying cumulative projects and the associated impacts. The list approach identifies individual projects known to be occurring or proposed in the surrounding area in order to 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 a combination of the list approach and the projection approach for the cumulative analysis and considers the development anticipated to occur upon buildout of the Davis General Plan in addition to the aforementioned planning projects (Paso Fino, 2860 West Covell Boulevard Building, Grande Subdivision, Chiles Ranch, URC expansion, Sterling Apartments, Cannery

(remainder of buildout), and Sutter Hospital Expansion) that are presumed not to have been included within the projections provided by the Davis General Plan.

Project Assumptions

The project's contribution to environmental impacts under cumulative conditions is based on full buildout of the proposed project. See Chapter 2.0, Project Description, for a complete description of the proposed project.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts for most issue areas are not quantifiable and are therefore discussed in general terms as they pertain to development patterns in the surrounding region. Exceptions to this are traffic, noise and air quality (the latter two of which are associated with traffic volumes), which may be quantified by estimating future traffic patterns, pollutant emitters, etc. and determining the combined effects that may result. In consideration of the cumulative scenario described above, the proposed project may result in the following cumulative impacts.

AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES

Impact 4.1: The project may contribute to the cumulative degradation of the existing visual character of the region (Cumulatively Considerable and Significant and Unavoidable)

The cumulative setting for aesthetics is the Davis Planning Area, as defined in the City of Davis General Plan. Under cumulative conditions, buildout of the Davis General Plan would result in changes to the visual character of the Davis Planning Area and result in impacts to localized views as new development occurs within the City and the Planning Area.

There are no designated State Scenic Highways in the vicinity of the project site. There are no highways in Yolo County listed as Designated Scenic Highway by the Caltrans Scenic Highway Mapping System.

As described in Section 3.1, Aesthetics, the project would introduce new sources of nighttime lighting, which may result in increased nighttime lighting in the project vicinity. The project will be required to comply with the City's Outdoor Lighting Control Ordinance which includes provision of a lighting plan as part of the construction documents as a standard City requirement. Project development could result in glare impacts; however, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.1-1, impacts related to cumulative light and glare would be ***less than cumulatively considerable***.

Implementation of the proposed project would change the visual character of the project site by introducing new residential and mixed uses to an undeveloped site. The project site has been previously used for agricultural uses, and is currently designated for agricultural uses by the Davis General Plan. As described in Section 3.1, project implementation would result in significant adverse impacts to the visual character or quality of the site. Development of the proposed project, in addition to other future projects in the area, would change the existing visual and scenic qualities of the City. There are no mitigation measures that could reduce this impact except a

ceasing of all future development, which is not a feasible option. As such, impacts related to the existing visual character would be ***cumulatively considerable*** and ***significant and unavoidable***.

AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact 4.2: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on agricultural land and uses (Cumulatively Considerable and Significant and Unavoidable)

As described in Section 3.2, the project site is zoned for agricultural uses by the County. The project site is also currently designated for agricultural uses by the Davis General Plan Land Use Map. There are no existing agricultural operations or activities on the project site. The entire project site is designated as Farmland of Local Importance by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. The project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

While the project site is designated as Farmland of Local Importance by the California Department of Conservation, the project site does contain prime soils as defined by the Yolo County Agricultural Conservation and Mitigation Program. Brentwood silty clay loam (BrA) and Marvin silty clay loam (Mf) (if irrigated) both qualify as prime agricultural land under the Yolo County Agricultural Conservation and Mitigation Program.

As further described in Section 3.2, implementation of the proposed project may result in indirect pressure to convert agricultural lands to a non-agricultural use or conflict with agricultural operations other than the aerial application of pesticides. The project has the potential to impact adjacent pesticide application due to the County Agricultural Commissioner's Conditions Covering the Use of Restricted Materials guidance. According to the guidance, aerial application of "danger" labeled pesticides requires a 500-foot buffer from environmentally sensitive areas. The proposed project includes a 150-foot AG buffer. However, 350 feet of the required 500-foot setback would need to encroach onto the adjacent agricultural land. Therefore, if aerial application of pesticides is deemed necessary on the adjacent farmlands, the proposed project would indirectly disrupt farming operations on the adjacent property. Overall, cumulative impacts on agricultural land and uses would be ***cumulatively considerable*** and ***significant and unavoidable***.

AIR QUALITY

Impact 4.3: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on the region's air quality (Cumulatively Considerable and Significant and Unavoidable)

The cumulative setting for air quality is the Davis Planning Area, as defined by the City of Davis General Plan, combined with the Paso Fino, 2860 West Covell Boulevard Building, Grande Subdivision, Chiles Ranch, URC expansion, Sterling Apartments, Cannery (remainder of buildout) projects.

Cumulative Operational Emissions: Yolo County has a state designation of Nonattainment for ozone, particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), and is either Unclassified or Attainment for all other criteria pollutants. Yolo County has a national designation of Nonattainment for ozone, and PM₁₀, and Partial Nonattainment for PM_{2.5}. The County is designated either attainment or unclassified for

4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

all other criteria pollutants. Operational activities would increase emissions of reactive organic gasses (ROG), nitric oxide (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), and PM₁₀. The emissions model showed that ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀ emissions are projected to exceed the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) threshold of significance. Mitigation Measure 3.3-1 is provided to reduce project-related operational emissions (area source and mobile source) for ROG, NO_x, and PM₁₀. The mitigation would bring operational emissions of ROG below the YSAQMD threshold of significance, but P PM₁₀ and NO_x would remain above the threshold. With incorporation of Mitigation Measure 3.3-1, the proposed project was determined to have a significant impact to operational emissions. As such, the proposed project would have a ***cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable*** impact on operational emissions.

Cumulative Construction Emissions: Construction activities would increase emissions of ROG and NO_x (Ozone precursors), CO, and PM₁₀. The emissions model showed that ROG, NO_x and PM₁₀ emissions are projected to fall below the YSAQMD thresholds of significance. Additionally, with the implementation of the YSAQMD-recommended dust mitigation, the PM₁₀ emissions from construction activities would be reduced by approximately 85%. Therefore, the proposed project was determined to have a less than significant impact relative to construction emissions. Implementation of the proposed project would have a ***less than cumulatively considerable*** impact from construction emissions.

Cumulative CO Emissions: The region is designated attainment for CO, which means that there are low background concentrations of CO. The screening-level of analysis found that there are not any risks for CO hotspots because there is no existing or future street or intersection with substantial traffic volumes that is forecast to operate at an unacceptable LOS F or worse with the recommended mitigation. Individually, the proposed project was determined to have a less than significant impact relative to CO emissions. Implementation of the proposed project would have a ***less than cumulatively considerable*** impact from CO emissions.

Cumulative TAC Emissions-Sensitive Receptors: The proposed project does not include any of the TAC source categories listed in the *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective* (CARB, 2007). The proposed project does not include the long-term operation of any other major onsite stationary sources of TACs. In addition, no major stationary sources of TACs have been identified in the immediate vicinity of the project site. The project site is not located adjacent to a freeway or high traffic road that is considered a significant source of mobile source air toxics. The closest traffic facility that poses a risk from mobile source air toxics is State Route (SR) 113, located approximately 1,300 feet to the east of the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would not be anticipated to result in an increased exposure of sensitive receptors to localized concentrations of TACs that would exceed applicable standards. Individually, the proposed project was determined to have a less than significant impact relative to TACs on sensitive receptors. Implementation of the proposed project would have a ***less than cumulatively considerable*** impact from to TACs on sensitive receptors.

Cumulative Odors-Sensitive Receptors: The two closest producers of odors include the Yolo County Landfill located northwest of the County Road 104 and County Road 28H intersection, and

the Davis Waste Water Treatment facility located on County Road 28H just east of County Road 105. These facilities are located 4.66 and 5.60 miles away from the project site, respectively. These distances are beyond the screening distance of one mile that is recommended by the YSAQMD. There are no other known producers of odors within vicinity of the project site. Individually, the proposed project was determined to have a less than significant impact relative to objectionable odors on sensitive receptors. Implementation of the proposed project would have a ***less than cumulatively considerable*** impact from to objectionable odors on sensitive receptors.

Cumulative Dust Emissions-Sensitive Receptors: The region is designated nonattainment for PM₁₀, which is largely attributed to dust. Construction activities would increase dust emissions. The emissions model showed that PM₁₀ emissions are not projected to exceed the threshold of significance during construction. Additionally, with the implementation of the YSAQMD recommended dust mitigation requirements, the PM₁₀ emissions from construction activities would be reduced to by a further 99% below the unmitigated scenario. Individually, the proposed project was determined to have a less than significant impact relative to construction related dust emissions. Implementation of the proposed project would have a ***less than cumulatively considerable*** impact from dust emissions.

Conclusion: Overall, because operational emissions would be significant, the proposed project would have a ***cumulatively considerable*** and ***significant and unavoidable*** impact.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Impact 4.4: The project may contribute to the cumulative loss of biological resources including habitats and special status species (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The cumulative setting for biological resources includes the City of Davis Planning Area and the greater Yolo County region. Development associated with implementation of the Davis General Plan would contribute to the ongoing loss of natural and agricultural lands in the Davis area, which currently provide habitat for a variety of species. Cumulative development would result in the conversion of existing agricultural habitat to urban uses. The Davis General Plan, in addition to regional, State and federal regulations, includes policies and measures that mitigate impacts to biological resources associated with General Plan buildout. Development outside of Davis in Yolo County, would also be subject to the same regional, State and federal regulations addressing sensitive species. Implementation of regional, State and federal regulations, such as the Endangered Species Act would also minimize risks to sensitive populations and reduce cumulative impacts throughout the region.

As described in Section 3.4, Biological Resources, construction on the project site has the potential to result in impacts to special-status species on the project site. Occurrences of special-status species have been documents on the project site. As described in Section 3.4, mitigation measures will be implemented to ensure that construction activities do not adversely impact biological resources or special-status species. Project implementation would not result in any indirect or offsite impacts to biological resources. This is considered a ***less than cumulatively considerable*** impact.

CULTURAL AND TRIBAL RESOURCES

Impact 4.5: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on known and undiscovered cultural resources (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The cumulative setting for cultural resources includes the City of Davis Planning Area and the surrounding areas of Yolo County. Cumulative development anticipated in Davis and the greater Yolo County area, including growth projected by adopted general plans, may result in the discovery and removal of cultural resources, including archaeological, paleontological, historical, and Native American resources and human remains. As discussed in Section 3.5, Cultural and Tribal Resources, there are two known cultural or historic resources present on the project site: site PA-17-22 and P-57-000138 (CA-YOL-173H). Site PA-17-22, an above ground well pump, concrete standpipe, and scatter of sheet metal and concrete fragments located near the southwestern corner of the project area, is not associated with important events or people, nor is it distinctive in any way. This feature is not eligible for the CRHR. Site P-57-000138 (CA-YOL-173H) is no longer present except for two rows of introduced cypress and Italian cypress trees. Removal of any on-site trees on the project site is subject to the City's Tree Ordinance and would be addressed by a standard City condition of approval which requires preparation of a Tree Protection Plan for trees being preserved and approval of Tree Modification Permit for trees being removed with standard measures for tree replacement or payment for the appraised value of the trees.

Mitigation measures provided in Section 3.5 would require the proposed project to evaluate any resources discovered during construction activities. Any significant finds would be required to be preserved, either through relocation or documentation and the project is not anticipated to considerably contribute to a significant reduction in cultural resources. Therefore, the project would have a ***less than cumulatively considerable*** contribution to impacts to cultural resources and no further mitigation is required.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Impact 4.6: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on geologic and soils characteristics (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The cumulative setting area for geology and soils includes the City of Davis Planning Area. As discussed in Section 3.6, Geology and Soils, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to this environmental topic. Geologic and soils impacts tend to be site-specific and project-specific. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in increased risks or hazards related to geologic conditions in the cumulative setting area, nor would it result in any off-site or indirect impacts. Additionally, as described in Section 3.6, mineral resources were not found to be a significant issue for the City of Davis and would therefore have no impact related to mineral resources. This is considered to be a ***less than cumulatively considerable*** impact, and no further mitigation is required.

GREENHOUSE GASES, CLIMATE CHANGE, AND ENERGY

Impact 4.7: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on greenhouse gases and climate change (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The cumulative setting for this issue (climate change) comprises anthropogenic (i.e., human-made) GHG emissions sources across the globe and no project alone would reasonably be expected to contribute to a noticeable incremental change to the global climate. However, legislation and executive orders on the subject of climate change in California have established a statewide context and process for developing an enforceable statewide cap on GHG emissions. Given the nature of environmental consequences from GHGs and global climate change, CEQA requires that lead agencies consider evaluating the cumulative impacts of GHGs. Small contributions to this cumulative impact (from which significant effects are occurring and are expected to worsen over time) may be potentially considerable and, therefore, significant.

The analysis of GHGs and climate change included in Section 3.7 was conducted at the cumulative level, as described in greater detail in that EIR section. As described in Section 3.7, the proposed project is consistent with statewide, regional, and local planning efforts to reduce GHG emissions. The project is consistent with the City of Davis CAAP, and the City's GHG Standards for New Residential Projects. As required by Mitigation Measure 3.7-1, the proposed project must be designed to comply with Tier 1 of the 2016 CalGreen Code, which would assist the City of Davis in meeting their adopted GHG reduction targets. Additionally, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to the use of inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary use of energy, and the development of other projects would not cause a cumulative impact to the use of energy. This is considered to be a ***less than cumulatively considerable*** impact, and no further mitigation is required.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Impact 4.8: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The cumulative setting area for hazards and hazardous materials is the City of Davis Planning Area. As discussed in Section 3.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to this environmental topic. Hazard-related impacts tend to be site-specific and project-specific. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in increased risks of hazards in the cumulative setting area, nor would it result in any off-site or indirect impacts. Mitigation measures have been included to reduce the risk of on-site hazards associated with prior uses on the project site, and hazards that could occur during construction activities. This is considered to be a ***less than cumulatively considerable*** impact, and no further mitigation is required.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Impact 4.9: The project may contribute to cumulative increases in peak stormwater runoff flows from the project site (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

Implementation of the proposed project would add impervious surfaces on the project site, which could increase peak stormwater runoff rates and volumes on and downstream of the site. However, the proposed project includes an extensive system of on-site stormwater collection, treatment and retention facilities to accommodate the increased stormwater flows that would originate on and off-site.

As indicated on page 5G-15 of the General Plan Update EIR, a proposed land use would be considered to have a significant impact if the new land use would “result in a substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in on- or off-site flooding; or create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage facilities.” The effect of the proposed project plus other development in the project area, leading to buildout of the General Plan, could be to increase stormwater flows to a degree that would exceed existing drainage system capacity and cause flooding downstream. As described in greater detail in Section 3.9, the proposed project would include a stormwater detention system that would ensure that the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable incremental increase in stormwater flows that would result in flooding downstream of the project site. Furthermore, future development within the City of Davis would be required to comply with City drainage plans and polices to ensure that each project would not cause a significant negative impact to other drainage facilities in the watershed. Permanent storm water control measures would be reviewed by the City Public Works Department for consistency prior to implementation of the project. Therefore, a ***less than cumulatively considerable*** impact would result from implementation of the proposed project, following the implementation of the mitigation measures included in Section 3.9.

Impact 4.10: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts related to degradation of water quality (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

Construction of the proposed project could contribute to a cumulative increase in urban pollutant loading, which would adversely affect water quality. Cumulative development in the Davis area, including the proposed project, could also result in increased impervious surfaces that could increase the rate and amount of runoff, thereby potentially adversely affecting existing surface water quality through increased erosion and sedimentation. The primary sources of water pollution include: runoff from roadways and parking lots; runoff from landscaping areas; non-stormwater connections to the drainage system; accidental spills; and illegal dumping. Runoff from roadway and parking lots could contain oil, grease, and heavy metals; additionally, runoff from landscaped areas could contain elevated concentrations of nutrients, fertilizers, and pesticides.

The mitigation measures for the project-specific impacts identified in Section 3.9 would reduce the pollutants in the stormwater from this project to a level lower than in the runoff from most developed areas within the Davis area, because most of these areas were constructed before stormwater quality BMPs were required. Additionally, future development projects would be

required to implement BMPs comparable to the BMPs identified in this project. However, without implementation of proper BMPs, this project and other future projects would result in a continued decrease in the water quality of the local Davis natural drainage system. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.6-1 (Section 3.6, Geology and Soils) and 3.9-2 would ensure that the project results in a ***less than cumulatively considerable*** impact to surface water quality.

LAND USE

Impact 4.11: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on communities and local land uses (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The cumulative setting for land use and planning impacts includes the City of Davis and the Davis Planning Area, as well the Paso Fino, 2860 West Covell Boulevard Building, Grande Subdivision, Chiles Ranch, URC expansion, Sterling Apartments, Cannery Park (remainder of buildout) projects. Cumulative land use and planning impacts, such as the potential for conflicts with adjacent land uses and consistency with adopted plans and regulations, are typically site- and project-specific. Subsequent projects allowed by the Davis General Plan may result in site specific land use conflicts; however, these effects are not anticipated to be cumulatively considerable. Prior to project authorization, the City of Davis would amend the General Plan to designate the site for the land uses proposed by the project applicant. Additionally, the project site would be pre-zoned as Planned Development (PD). The proposed PD would provide for the range of uses and development standards consistent with the project as described in Chapter 2.0 and would ensure that all applicable zoning requirements are met. As part of the project approval process, the project applicant will be required to submit a final development plan consistent with the requirements of Article 40.22 for review and approval of the City Council through a public hearing process, thereby eliminating any potential zoning code impacts.

Land use conflicts are site-specific and would not result in a cumulative impact. Incompatibility issues are generally addressed and mitigated on a project-by-project basis. The proposed project has been designed to be consistent with applicable aspects of the City's General Plan, and as described in this EIR, the project would not be incompatible with any of the surrounding land uses. The project's contribution to cumulative land use impacts is ***less than cumulatively considerable***, and no further mitigation is required.

NOISE

Impact 4.12: The project may contribute to the cumulative exposure of existing and future noise- sensitive land uses or to increased noise resulting from cumulative development (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The cumulative context for noise impacts associated with the proposed project consists of the existing and future noise sources that could affect the project or surrounding uses. Noise generated by construction would be temporary, and would not add to the permanent noise environment or be considered as part of the cumulative context. The total construction noise impact of the proposed project would not be a substantial increase to the existing future noise environment.

4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

As discussed in Impact 3.11-5 in Section 3.11, Noise and Vibration, the on-site noise sources generated by the Activity and Wellness Center area include mechanical equipment, parking lot use, and swimming pool activities. Additional on-site noise sources are associated with activity at the proposed dog exercise area. Heating, air conditioning, and ventilation (HVAC) noise levels would be approximately 35 dBA L_{eq} , or less, at the nearest sensitive receptor. Additionally, during the busiest hour of operations, noise levels resulting from the swimming pool activities would be 60 dB L_{eq} . Further, during the busiest hour of the day, noise levels resulting from the dog exercise area would be 53 dB L_{eq} . These uses are considered to be amenities to the project site, and will not exceed noise level standards at any existing adjacent uses. Overall, operational noise associated with the proposed HVAC system, swimming pool, and dog park would not be anticipated to exceed the noise levels set forth in the City of Davis Noise Ordinance, and impacts related to operational noise were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.

Based upon the site plan, and the predicted traffic noise levels shown in Table 3.11-9, the overall predicted traffic noise levels will not exceed 65.1 dB $L_{dn}/CNEL$, which falls within the City of Davis "Conditionally Acceptable" noise level standard of 60 to 70 dB $L_{dn}/CNEL$. The highest predicted traffic noise levels are predicted along Covell Boulevard Court under the Cumulative Plus Project condition (65.1 dB). However, this increase is not considered a significant increase in traffic noise levels (+0.2 dB). At no point would the project result in an exceedance of the City of Davis exterior noise level standard. Therefore, this is a *less than cumulatively considerable* impact.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Impact 4.13: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on population growth and displace substantial numbers of people or existing housing (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

As described in Section 3.12, growth in the City of Davis is limited by the 1% Growth Policy, which implements General Plan Policy LU 1.1 and associated Actions d and e. The City's 1% Growth Policy would allow approximately 263 dwelling units per year, based on the DOF estimate of 26,366 units in 2014. The 1% Growth Policy includes provisions to accommodate larger projects. The 1% Growth Policy requires larger projects (such as 100 or more units) to use a development agreement or a metered allocation system to phase units. The City's Housing Element, in discussing constraints to growth, identifies that larger projects would include provisions for phasing development through a development agreement.

The City of Davis 1% Growth Policy would be applicable to the project. Second units, vertical mixed use units, and permanently affordable very low, low, and moderate income housing are exempt from the growth guideline. Therefore, the 150 affordable units would not count towards the growth limit. The expected increase in 410 residential units, over a multi-year construction period, would not exceed the limits set by the 1% Growth Policy.

It is noted that construction of the project would be phased in order to reach an aging Davis population over an extended period of time. Construction of the 150 affordable senior apartment homes would occur in two 75-unit phases in order to ensure that local Davis residents are the

primary market for occupancy. The project is also consistent with the regional growth projections prepared by SACOG.

Additionally, as described in Section 3.12, implementation of the proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people or existing project. The proposed project would have a ***less than cumulatively considerable*** impact to this topic.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND RECREATION

Impact 4.14: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on public services (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

Implementation of the proposed project would contribute toward an increased demand for public services and facilities within the City of Davis. Public service and facility needs for the City of Davis have been evaluated in the Davis General Plan, and the goals and policies included in the General Plan ensure that adequate services will be available for build-out of the General Plan according to the current Land Use Diagram. The current Land Use Diagram shows the project site as Agricultural. Therefore, development of the project site with residential uses would exceed the demand for public services and facilities anticipated in the Davis General Plan. However, as demonstrated in this Draft EIR, impacts to public services and facilities as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant. Therefore, the project's cumulative contribution to the City's public service and facility needs would be ***less than cumulatively considerable***. Furthermore, other future development projects would be required by the City to pay their fair share fees toward the expansion and creation of public services and facilities. Therefore, cumulative impacts associated with public services and facilities would be considered less-than-significant.

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Impact 4.15: Under cumulative plus project conditions, project implementation would cause significant impacts at study intersections (Cumulatively Considerable and Significant and Unavoidable)

As described in Section 3.14, Transportation and Circulation, under the cumulative plus project condition, the West Covell Boulevard/SR 113 NB Ramps intersection would operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour under cumulative no project conditions. This condition is primarily caused by the heavy volume of northbound off-ramp traffic, which is served by single left- and right-turn lanes. Queue spillback on the westbound approach extends back to the West Covell Boulevard/Sycamore Lane intersection, thereby contributing to its LOS F operations.

The addition of project trips to cumulative no project conditions would worsen LOS F conditions during the PM peak hour at the West Covell Boulevard/SR 113 NB Ramps and West Covell Boulevard/Sycamore Lane intersections. Average delay at these intersections would increase by 11 and 20 seconds, respectively.

4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

As noted in Table 3.14-20 in Section 3.14, Transportation and Circulation, the project would cause greater than a five-second increase in PM peak hour delay to the following study intersections, which are projected to operate at LOS F under cumulative conditions without the project:

- West Covell Boulevard/SR 113 NB Ramps (LOS F) – project-added traffic would cause an 11-second increase in delay.
- West Covell Boulevard/Sycamore Lane (LOS F) – project-added traffic would cause a 20-second increase in delay.

Although the project would add traffic to other study intersections, the resulting LOS and delay values would not exceed the applicable significance criteria. Mitigation Measure 3.14-1 in Section 3.14 would require the project applicant to contribute fair share funding to cover their proportionate cost of the following intersection improvements:

- a) West Covell Boulevard/SR 113 NB Ramps – widen northbound off-ramp to consist of three lanes (i.e., one left, one shared left/through/right, and one right-turn lane) approaching West Covell Boulevard.
- b) West Covell Boulevard/Sycamore Lane – lengthen eastbound left-turn lane from 150 to 275 feet.

These improvements would achieve over a one-minute travel time savings for Route 1 (northbound off-ramp to westbound West Covell Boulevard) during the PM peak hour.

The widening of the SR 113 northbound off-ramp would occur within Caltrans right-of-way, and would therefore require Caltrans approvals. It is unknown whether additional right-of-way would be needed for this improvement, or if a design exception would be required. There are no assurances that Caltrans would approve and/or fund such a widening. Since the remaining fair share funding sources needed for construction have not been identified, fair share payment would not ensure construction.

The lengthening of the eastbound left-turn lane at the West Covell Boulevard/Sycamore Lane intersection is considered feasible because the roadway is maintained by the City of Davis, right-of-way is available, and no adjacent intersections, driveway, or turn lanes would be adversely affected. However, this turn lane lengthening is not sufficient, on its own, to restore operations to LOS E (i.e., northbound off-ramp widening is also required). Therefore, project impacts at these two study intersections are considered ***cumulatively considerable*** and ***significant and unavoidable*** despite the presence of mitigation measures, which if implemented, would improve intersection operations to acceptable levels.

Impact 4.16: Under cumulative plus project conditions, project implementation would cause significant impacts at study freeway facilities (Cumulatively Considerable and Significant and Unavoidable)

As described in Section 3.14, Transportation and Circulation, under the cumulative plus project condition, Table 3.14-23 in Section 3.14 indicates that all study freeway facilities would continue to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better under cumulative plus project conditions. However, the

project would contribute to vehicular queuing that extends from the SR 113 northbound off-ramp at West Covell Boulevard onto the SR 113 freeway mainline.

As shown in Table 3.14-27 in Section 3.14, this operating condition would cause the northbound off-ramp to have a maximum queue of 2,225 feet, which would extend beyond the gore point back onto the SR 113 freeway mainline section. The addition of project trips would cause the maximum off-ramp queue to increase by 200 feet.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.14-1(a) would change the maximum queue in the northbound SR 113 off-ramp at West Covell Boulevard. The off-ramp widening would reduce the maximum queue during the PM peak hour from 2,425 feet to 750 feet under cumulative plus project conditions. Because 1,180 feet of storage is provided, this mitigation measure, if implemented, would result in traffic no longer spilling onto the SR 113 mainline under cumulative plus project conditions.

However, the widening of the SR 113 northbound off-ramp would occur within Caltrans right-of-way, and would therefore require Caltrans approvals. Because there are no assurances that Caltrans would approve such a widening, impacts to freeway facilities are considered ***cumulatively considerable*** and ***significant and unavoidable*** despite the presence of a mitigation measure, which if implemented, would alleviate the queuing issue.

UTILITIES

Impact 4.17: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on utilities (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The cumulative setting for utilities includes the City of Davis Planning Area. Under General Plan buildout conditions, plus development of additional projects that are currently planned (as described previously), the City of Davis would see an increased demand for water service, sewer service, solid waste disposal services, and stormwater infrastructure needs.

As described under Impact 3.15-1, there is currently adequate capacity at the City's WWTP to receive and treat all of the wastewater generated by the proposed project in addition to future development under cumulative conditions. Project implementation would not result in the need for new or expanded WWTP facilities, and would not exceed the existing or projected capacity of the City's WWTP. Therefore, the project's cumulative impact to wastewater services is ***less than cumulatively considerable***, and no additional mitigation is required.

As described under Impact 3.15-2, the potable water demands for the proposed project, together with the City's existing water demands and projected future water demands, are within the water demand projections included in the City's 2015 UWMP. Potable water would be provided from the City's municipal water supply. As demonstrated by the analysis in Section 3.15 and under Impact 3.15-2, there are adequate water supplies to serve cumulative demand within the City, and the proposed project would result in ***less than cumulatively considerable*** impacts to water supplies.

4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

As described in greater detail in Section 3.9, the proposed project would include a stormwater detention system that would ensure that the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable incremental increase in stormwater flows that would result in flooding downstream of the project site. Furthermore, future development within the City of Davis would be required to comply with City drainage plans and polices to ensure that each project would not cause a significant negative impact to other drainage facilities in the watershed. This is a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

As described under Impact 3.15-3, all non-recyclable waste generated by the City of Davis is disposed of at the 722-acre Yolo County Central Landfill, which is located off County Road 28H near its intersection with County Road 104. The landfill is owned and operated by the Yolo County Department of Public Works and Transportation. As described in the Yolo County General Plan Draft EIR (Yolo County, April 2009), the Central Landfill is a Class III solid waste landfill which provides comprehensive solid waste and recycling services, including municipal solid waste, recycling, salvaging, household hazardous waste, and business hazardous waste. Permitted maximum disposal (“throughput”) at the Central Landfill is 1,800 tons per day. The total permitted capacity of the landfill is 49,035,200 cubic yards. At the current waste disposal rate (also assuming a diversion rate of 70 percent, no large increase of waste from outside the County, and future waste cells operated as bioreactors (described previously) the landfill’s closure date is estimated to be January 1, 2081.

The proposed project would be required to comply with applicable state and local requirements including those pertaining to solid waste, construction waste diversion, and recycling. Specifically, Chapter 32 of the City’s Municipal Code regulates the management of garbage, recyclables, and other wastes. Chapter 32 sets forth solid waste collection and disposal requirements for residential and commercial customers, and addresses yard waste, hazardous materials, recyclables, and other forms of solid waste.

As previously described, permitted maximum disposal at the Central Landfill is 1,800 tons per day. The total permitted capacity of the landfill is 49,035,200 cubic yards, which is expected to accommodate an operational life of about 68 years (January 1, 2081). The addition of the volume of 2.32 tons/day of solid waste generated by the proposed project to the Yolo County Central Landfill would not exceed the landfill’s remaining capacity. This is a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

4.2 GROWTH-INDUCING EFFECTS

INTRODUCTION

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate the growth-inducing impacts of a proposed action. A growth-inducing impact is defined by the CEQA Guidelines as:

The way in which a proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove

obstacles to population growth...It is not assumed that growth in an area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

Section 15126 of the CEQA Guidelines identifies criteria for evaluating the extent to which growth could be induced, accelerated, intensified, or shifted as a result of the proposed project. Subsection (d) provides the framework for a discussion of these potential growth-inducing impacts, as follows:

- Would the project foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing?
- Would the project remove obstacles to population growth?
- Would the project tax existing community facilities?
- Would the project encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively?

The proposed project would result in the construction of additional housing within the City of Davis. As discussed in Section 3.12, Population and Housing, growth in the City of Davis is limited by the 1% Growth Policy. The 1% Growth Policy would allow approximately 263 dwelling units per year, based on the Department of Finance estimate of 26,366 units in the City in 2016. The City of Davis 1% Growth Policy would be applicable to the project. Second units, vertical mixed use units, and permanently affordable very low, low, and moderate income housing are exempt from the growth guideline. Therefore, the 150 affordable units would not count towards the growth limit. The expected increase in 410 residential units, over a multi-year construction period, would not exceed the limits set by the 1% Growth Policy.

By providing additional age-restricted and non-age restricted housing within the City of Davis, the project would provide areas for seniors and other members of the community to live. The project would not remove obstacles to population growth.

Additionally, as discussed in Section 3.13, Public Services and Recreation, the proposed project would increase demand for other public facilities within the City of Davis, such as libraries and community buildings. However, given that the additional population increase associated with the project is a small percentage of the population of the City as a whole, significant impacts due to increased demand on community facilities are not expected. The proposed project includes a 4.3-acre mixed use area, which would provide additional community facilities. Current plans for the facility include a health club, restaurant, meeting rooms, and an outdoor swimming pool all for use by residents and the public. The project also includes a perimeter 1.4-mile bicycle/pedestrian path that connects into the proposed internal greenway system and the existing City bicycle and trail system.

As demonstrated throughout this Draft EIR, the proposed project would not encourage or facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. Any significant or potentially significant impacts discussed throughout this Draft EIR would occur within the proposed project site only.

4.3 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE EFFECTS

Legal Considerations

CEQA Section 15126.2(c) and Public Resources Code Sections 21100(b)(2) and 21100.1(a), requires that the EIR include a discussion of significant irreversible environmental changes which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented. Irreversible environmental effects are described as:

- The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources;
- The primary and secondary impacts of a project would generally commit future generations to similar uses (e.g., a highway provides access to previously remote area);
- The project involves uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents associated with the project; or
- The phasing of the proposed consumption of resources is not justified (e.g., the project involves the wasteful use of energy).

Determining whether the proposed project would result in significant irreversible effects requires a determination of whether key resources would be degraded or destroyed such that there would be little possibility of restoring them. Irrecoverable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

Analysis

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the development of a residential mixed use project on 74 acres of unoccupied land that is currently designated Agricultural by the Davis General Plan. This property was previously used for agricultural purposes. Development of the proposed project would constitute a long-term commitment to residential uses. It is unlikely that circumstances would arise that would justify the return of the land to its prior condition.

A variety of resources, including land, energy, water, construction materials, and human resources would be irretrievably committed for the project's initial construction, infrastructure installation, and its continued maintenance. Construction of the project would require the commitment of a variety of other non-renewable or slowly renewable natural resources such as lumber and other forest products, sand and gravel, asphalt, petrochemicals, and metals.

Additionally, a variety of resources would be committed to the ongoing operation and life of the proposed project. The introduction of new residential uses to the site will result in an increase in area traffic over existing conditions. Fossil fuels are the principal source of energy and the project will increase consumption of available supplies, including gasoline and diesel fuel, and natural gas. These energy resource demands relate to initial project construction, project operation and site maintenance and the transport of people and goods to and from the project site. Additional information the estimated energy usage of the proposed project can be found under Impact 3.7-3 of Section 3.7, Greenhouse Gases, Climate Change, and Energy. This impact concluded that project

implementation would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary use of energy resources.

4.4 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b) requires an EIR to discuss unavoidable significant environmental effects, including those that can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance. The following significant and unavoidable impacts of the West Davis Active Adult Community Project are discussed in Chapters 3.1 through 3.15 (project-level) and previously in this chapter (cumulative-level).

- Impact 3.1-1: Potential to result in substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas and resources or substantial degradation of visual character
- Impact 3.2-1: Project implementation may result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural uses
- Impact 3.2-4: Project implementation may lead to the indirect conversion of adjacent agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses
- Impact 3.3-1: Project operations have the potential to cause a violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation
- Impact 3.14-5: Under cumulative plus project conditions, project implementation would cause significant impacts at study intersections
- Impact 3.14-6: Under cumulative plus project conditions, project implementation would cause significant impacts at study freeway facilities
- Impact 3.14-9: The proposed site plan would not provide adequate emergency vehicle access
- Impact 3.14-10: The proposed site plan would not provide adequate project access
- Impact 4.1: The project may contribute to the cumulative degradation of the existing visual character of the region
- Impact 4.2: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on agricultural land and uses
- Impact 4.3: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on the region's air quality
- Impact 4.15: Under cumulative plus project conditions, project implementation would cause significant impacts at study intersections
- Impact 4.16: Under cumulative plus project conditions, project implementation would cause significant impacts at study freeway facilities

This page left intentionally blank.