2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The Executive Summary chapter of the EIR provides an overview of the Mace Ranch Innovation Center (MRIC) Project (proposed project) and summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis provided in Sections 4.1 through 4.15, and Chapter 5. 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 and the Mixed-Use Alternative Analysis chapter, identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative, and discusses areas of controversy and issues to be resolved. Table 2-3, 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 2-3 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 228.58-acre project site (hereafter rounded to 229 acres) is located immediately east of the City of Davis city limits, near the "Mace Curve", in unincorporated Yolo County, approximately 2.5 miles east of downtown Davis. The MRIC portion of the proposed project is anticipated to include up to approximately 2,654,000 square feet of innovation center uses, of which up to 260,000 square feet (10 percent of the site) may be developed with supportive commercial uses.

The MRIC includes the following components: General Plan amendment, prezone, Preliminary Planned Development (PPD) and site plan and architectural review, utilities, combined Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence amendment, annexation, detachment from the East Davis County Fire Protection District, and development agreement.

The City of Davis has included the Mace Triangle within the overall project boundaries to ensure that an agricultural and unincorporated island is not created and to allow the continuation and expansion of existing uses. This EIR evaluates the potential for expansion of the Ikedas farm stand and additional urban development on the Ikedas parcel and adjacent agricultural parcel. The EIR assumes development of up to 71,056 square feet of general commercial uses, including up to 45,900 of research, office, and R&D, and up to 25,155 square feet of retail.

As a part of the project application, the City will prepare a proposed PPD Ordinance that would apply only to the three Mace Triangle parcels. Additional urban development in the future would be subject to further City review in connection with discretionary entitlements. The following entitlements are being sought for the Mace Triangle at this time: General Plan amendment,

prezone, PPD, utilities, combined Municipal Service Review and Sphere of Influence amendment, annexation, and detachment from the East Davis County Fire Protection District.

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.

The proposed project will be built-out over an extended period of time, a factor which is relevant to successful monitoring and reporting of the mitigation measure requirements set forth in this EIR. As a result, the list of mitigation measures in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for this EIR will be arranged in chronological order with respect to the order of approvals needed to enable physical development of the property.

Mitigation Trigger Points

The "trigger" points for the mitigation measure requirements include but are not necessarily limited to the following actions, for each phase of development, with the exception of those mitigation measures that do not apply to Phase 1, as identified in this EIR:

- In conjunction with submittal of a final planned development or tentative map
- Prior to approval of a final planned development
- In conjunction with submittal of improvement plans
- Prior to issuance of any building permits
- Prior to initiation of grading activities

Establishment of Master Owners' Association

As part of the overall MRIC management, the Applicant has proposed to form a Master Owners' Association ("MOA") that will oversee and perform various management and marketing tasks associated with the MRIC, including, but not limited to:

- Managing and maintaining the common areas and facilities;
- Enforcing MRIC-wide covenants, conditions and restrictions ("CC&Rs");
- Serving as a point of contact for, and reporting to, the City, on a regular basis, the MRIC's compliance with project approvals, including, but not limited to, the MRIC

conditions of approval, the mitigation monitoring and reporting plan, and the transportation demand management plan;
- Providing and pursuing ongoing branding, marketing and operational programs that will facilitate collaborative innovation partnerships, provide opportunities for increased University and public and private research engagement; and assist in the growth of new business ventures; and
- Account for and collect MOA assessments from the project owners/members.

The MOA will perform such further tasks and obligations as the City and the Applicant may agree upon.

The MOA would not extend to the Mace Triangle, which would be developed separately from the MRIC, by different landowners.

2.4 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Required Mitigation Measures (Table 2-3)

A summary of the identified impacts in the technical sections of the EIR is presented in Table 2-3. In Table 2-3, the proposed project impacts are identified for each technical section of Chapter 4 (Sections 4.1 through 4.15) of the EIR. In addition, Table 2-3 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 Summary of Alternatives to the Proposed Project

The range of alternatives evaluated in this EIR include the following:

1. No Project (No Build) Alternative;
2. Reduced Site Size Alternative;
3. Reduced Project Alternative;
4. Off-Site Alternative A (Davis Innovation Center Site);
5. Off-Site Alternative B (Covell Property);
6. Infill Alternative; and
7. Mixed-Use Alternative.

Alternatives 1 thru 5 are evaluated comparatively, at a qualitative level of detail, in Chapter 7, while Alternative 6 is considered but dismissed from further analysis. Alternative 7 is evaluated in Chapter 8 at a level equal to that undertaken for the proposed project.

Table 2-1 provides a summary comparison of the basic characteristics of the alternatives.

Table 2-1
Comparison of Alternatives Features

Project / Alternative	Acres				Square Feet				Dwelling Units			
	Proposed Project Total	MRIC	Mace Triangle	Alternate Site	Proposed Project Total	MRIC	Mace Triangle	Alternate Site	Proposed Project Total	MRIC	Mace Triangle	Alternate Site
Proposed Project	228.5	212.0	16.5	N/A	2,725,056	2,654,000	71,056	N/A	--	--	--	N/A
No Project (No Build) Alternative	212.0	212.0	--	N/A	--	--	--	N/A	--	--	--	N/A
Reduced Site Size Alternative	122.5	106.0	16.5	N/A	2,725,056	2,654,000	71,056	N/A	--	--	--	N/A
Reduced Project Alternative	66	49.5	16.5	N/A	611,056	540,000	71,056	N/A	--	--	--	N/A
Off-Site Alternative A (Davis Innovation Center Site)	207.8	--	--	207.8	2,654,000	2,654,000	--	2,654,000	--	--	--	--
Off-Site Alternative B (Covell Property)	236.0	--	--	236.0	2,654,000	2,654,000	--	2,654,000	--	--	--	--
Infill Alternative	82.0	--	--	82.0	2,654,000	2,654,000	--	2,654,000	--	--	--	--
Mixed-Use Alternative	228.5	212.0	16.5	N/A	2,725,056	2,654,000	71,056	--	850	850	--	--

Summary of No Project (No Build) Alternative

The No Project (No Build) Alternative is defined as continuation of existing agricultural and related uses over the entire 229-acre project site. The current operations on the MRIC site involve the generation of vehicle trips, use of tractors and other heavy-duty, off-road diesel equipment, water trucks, and a deep-well diesel pump for irrigation water. The site is designated and zoned by Yolo County for agricultural uses; thus, the site would continue in its current agricultural condition under the No Project (No Build) Alternative. For the No Project (No Build) Alternative, however, changes to the type of crop grown on the project site could occur at any time. In addition, various accessory structures are allowed within the A-N zone, including barns and storage sheds, grain elevators and silos, farm offices, greenhouses (up to 100,000 sf), other accessory agricultural support structures, and single family residences (minimum lot size of 80 acres). An "allowed use", such as an accessory structure, does not require a land use permit, but is still subject to permit requirements of other Yolo County divisions, such as Building, Environmental Health, and Public Works.

The 17-acre Mace Triangle site consists of three parcels located south of CR 32A. The northernmost parcel, APN 033-630-011, is partially developed with an Ikedas Market and a gravel parking lot. The southwestern parcel, APN 033-630-006, is developed with a City-owned water tank and a Park-and-Ride lot. The third and easternmost parcel, APN 033-630-012, is undeveloped but disturbed as a result of on-going agricultural operations. This eastern parcel is currently fallow. Vehicular access is provided to the Mace Triangle Site by a single driveway from CR 32A.

As discussed in further detail below, implementation of the No Project (No Build) Alternative would result in fewer overall impacts compared to the proposed project. However, because the No Project (No Build) Alternative would not involve the development of innovation center uses on the MRIC site or general commercial uses on the Mace Triangle site, the Alternative would not meet any of the basic project objectives (see Chapter 3 Project Description).

Summary of Reduced Site Size Alternative

The Reduced Site Size Alternative is defined as the entire MRIC on approximately one half of the MRIC site with no change to the Mace Triangle component. This Alternative assumes the same buildout square footage for the MRIC as the proposed project, but on a smaller site over a smaller footprint. Specifically, the Reduced Site Size Alternative would involve development of up to 2,654,000 square feet (sf) on the southern 106-acre portion of the proposed MRIC site, located north of County Road (CR) 32A and east of Mace Boulevard. The 17-acre Mace Triangle site is also included as part of the Reduced Site Size Alternative in order to avoid the creation of a County "island" property. Thus, the Reduced Site Size Alternative site would contain a total of approximately 122.58 acres. The same development assumptions, and mitigation measures,

identified for the Mace Triangle in the Project Description chapter and technical sections of this EIR, would apply for the Reduced Site Size Alternative.[1]

Due to the reduced amount of development area for the Reduced Site Size Alternative, the five-acre "Oval" and the greenways on the MRIC site are not included in the Alternative. The total open space area for the Reduced Site Size Alternative, including the courtyard plazas and the required 150-foot agricultural buffer, would be 27 acres, as compared to 64.6 acres under the proposed project. Access points to the Reduced Site Size Alternative would be similar to those proposed for the project (i.e., two access points along Mace Boulevard, and two southerly access points along CR 32A). A parking structure would be required for the Reduced Site Size Alternative in order to achieve a parking ratio compliant with City standards. Water and sewer improvements for the Reduced Site Size Alternative would be consistent with the improvements identified for the proposed project.

The research and development (R&D) buildings would have a maximum height of 65 feet and contain three to four stories. In addition, the manufacturing/research buildings would have a maximum height of 45 feet and would contain one to two stories, similar to the proposed project. Also similar to the proposed project is the hotel building, which would have a maximum height of 75 feet.

The Reduced Site Size Alternative would result in less impact overall as compared to the proposed project simply because the site size is reduced. The Reduced Site Size Alternative would, however, result in greater impacts than the proposed project related to aesthetics (i.e., increased building heights). This alternative would meet some of the objectives of the proposed project. However, the smaller site size would make it difficult to achieve a sufficient long term land supply for the full range of projected uses including those that require larger building footprints. The smaller site would double the intensity of development over the site which would result in design challenges and may be too dense to attract some desirable R&D users. The ability to attract medium-scale and large-scale users would be affected by the small footprint and there would be less flexibility in the user space to address the specific needs of some tenants as a result.

Summary of Reduced Project Alternative

The Reduced Project Alternative is defined as development of about one quarter of the MRIC site with about one fifth of the proposed square footage, and no change to the Mace Triangle component. This Alternative assumes buildout of only the western half (approximately 49.5 acres) of the 106-acre parcel described above for the Reduced Site Size Alternative. The rest of this parcel, or approximately 56 acres, would remain as agricultural land. A maximum of 540,000 square feet of development is assumed for the Reduced Project Alternative, which would include 400,000 square feet of research/manufacturing space to accommodate the

[1] The City property would be designated Public-Semi-Public to allow for the continuation of existing uses. New uses on the City property are not proposed. The Ikedas parcel and other agricultural parcel would be designated General Commercial to allow for the continuation or expansion of the existing agricultural retail (Ikedas market) and/or for the development of up to 71,056 sf of new commercial uses.

expansion needs of Schilling Robotics, and 140,000 square feet of research and development/office use, which may incorporate ground floor ancillary retail of up to 40,000 square feet.

Water and sewer improvements for the Reduced Project Alternative would be substantially consistent with the improvements identified for Phase 1 of the proposed project. Two access points would be provided for the Reduced Project Alternative: 1) a new intersection leg heading east at Mace Boulevard and Alhambra Boulevard; and 2) a new southern access point, which would connect to County Road 32A, east of the existing Park-and-Ride lot driveway. The southern access would be the principal point of entry for transport vehicles and goods movement traffic. Similar to the proposed project, the two research and development/office buildings would not exceed 55-feet in height, and the two research/manufacturing buildings would not exceed 45 feet in height. Total open space for the Reduced Project Alternative, including the required 150-foot agricultural buffer, would be approximately 17 acres.

This alternative would include the Mace Triangle site in order to avoid the creation of a County island property. The same development assumptions, and mitigation measures, identified for the Mace Triangle in the Project Description chapter and technical sections of this EIR, would apply for the Reduced Project Alternative.

This Alternative is essentially an analysis of Phase 1 of the MRIC. The Reduced Project Alternative includes the same square footage and land uses as MRIC Phase 1, with the only difference being the layout of the proposed buildings, as can be seen by comparing Figure 7-3 with Figure 3-20 of the EIR Project Description Chapter. As such, the mitigation requirements for Phase 1 of the proposed project would also be required for the Reduced Project Alternative. As a corollary, the mitigation measures not required until Phase 2 of the proposed project would not be required for the Reduced Project Alternative. The following proposed project mitigation measures would not be required for Phase 1/Reduced Project Alternative:

- MM 4.4-2(a) [VELB]
- MM 4.5-2(a) [Arch Resources]
- MM 4.7-2(b) [GHG Monitoring]
- MM 4.14-1 [Covell/Monarch Signal]
- MM 4.14-2(a) [Focused Traffic Study Requirement]
- MM 4.14-2 (b-d) [Mace Interchange Intersection Improvement Options]

The Reduced Project Alternative would result in less than 50 acres of development, just over one half million square feet, and is projected to be built out in under five years. This alternative would result in less impact as compared to the project; however, it fails to achieve the fundamental objectives of the City or the applicant to develop an integrated innovation center campus of approximately 200 acres in size, with sufficient land to meet demand over a 20 to 25 year period. As a result, this alternative would not result in a critical mass of users of various sizes sufficient to allow for a full range of research and market uses. It is also unlikely to support the necessary infrastructure and amenities to meet the City's sustainability, transportation, work environment, and fiscal/community benefit objectives. Moreover, the City would be unlikely to capture a greater share of local and regional business growth with such a small site. In addition,

because the overall gross FAR for this Alternative is approximately 0.38, this Alternative would not be consistent with the City's goal of at least 0.5 FAR. Also, the lack of hotel and conference center would not be consistent with the project objectives concerning the provision of such uses.

Summary of Off-Site Alternative A (Davis IC Site)

The Off-Site Alternative A is defined as continuation of existing agriculture and related uses over the entire 229-acre project site and development of the MRIC component only at an alternate site near the Sutter Davis Hospital. The Mace Triangle component of the project would not be built under this alternative. Buildout per Off-Site Alternative A (Davis Innovation Center Site) would assume development of the same proposed MRIC project at an alternative site, which in this case is the 207.75-acre Davis Innovation Center (Davis IC) site, located immediately west of the City of Davis city limits in Yolo County, approximately 2.5 miles west of downtown Davis. Regional access to the Davis IC Site is provided by the State Route 113/Covell Boulevard interchange, located southeast of the Davis IC Site. The Davis IC Site is identified by Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 036-060-005, and 036-020-012 thru -018. The Davis IC site, similar to the proposed project site, is currently used for agricultural purposes and is located near other existing development (to the east and south) and other agricultural uses (to the west and north).

Off-Site Alternative A (Davis IC site) would result in greater impact as compared to the project, particularly in the areas of biological resources, flooding and hydrology, and noise. This alternative would meet many of the objectives of the proposed project. However, the property is not controlled by, nor available to the applicant, and would not meet their objective related to proximity to I-80 and logical extension of the 2nd Street corridor, where existing technology businesses are located. This Alternative also would not provide an opportunity for the Mace Triangle agricultural retail business to expand as that property would remain in the County.

Summary of Off-Site Alternative B (Covell Property)

The Off-Site Alternative B is defined as continuation of existing agriculture and related uses over the entire 229-acre project site, and development of the MRIC component only at an alternate site near the Cannery project. The Mace Triangle component of the project would not be built under this alternative. Off-Site Alternative B (Covell Property) would assume development of the proposed project at an alternative site, which in this case is the Covell Property south of drainage Channel A (APN: 035-970-033). Generally, the property is north of East Covell Boulevard, east of the Cannery Project, west of Pole Line Road, and south of the City's old landfill site.

The Off-Site Alternative B (Covell Property) acreage totals approximately 236 acres. This Alternative is anticipated to include the same approximate development area as the proposed project, including a similar amount of open space area. Access to Off-Site Alternative B (Covell Property) would be provided along Covell Boulevard and Pole Line Road. The Covell Property site has one residence and associated outbuildings. The site has historically been and is currently used for agricultural purposes (row crops), and is surrounded by the City limits and urban uses on three sides, and agriculture on the north side. The site is designated in the County General

Plan and Zoning Ordinance as Specific Plan (S-P). According to the Yolo County General Plan, Specific Plan (SP) allows uses in the AG designation to continue temporarily until such time as the Specific Plan has been adopted, or the land use designation is otherwise amended. Ultimate land uses must be consistent with the adopted Specific Plan. Capital intensive agricultural uses are discouraged in lands designated Specific Plan so as not to preclude later planned uses. Identified planned uses in the County General Plan are commercial and mixed use (Yolo GP Policy 6.11f). The site is identified by LAFCO as falling within the 10-year sphere-of-influence for the City.

Off-Site Alternative B (Covell Property) would result in greater impacts, as compared to the proposed project, particularly in the areas of loss of agricultural land, biological resources, flooding, and noise. This alternative would meet many objectives of the proposed project. However, the property is not controlled by, nor available to the applicant, and would not meet their objective related to proximity to I-80 and logical extension of the 2nd Street corridor, where existing technology businesses are located. This Alternative also would not provide an opportunity for the Mace Triangle agricultural retail business to expand as that property would remain in the County.

Infill Alternative

This Alternative would consist of development of the same project components as the proposed project over multiple smaller off-site parcels within the City of Davis. According to the City of Davis, as of May 2015, there are approximately 153 net acres remaining within 32 properties or undeveloped portions of partially developed properties, which include sites that are zoned for office/flex and industrial building types and other commercial sites suitable for business growth. According to the vacant land information, out of the 32 properties, only 24 vacant sites, totaling approximately 82 acres, are currently available for development, meaning these 24 vacant sites are appropriately zoned for office and industrial building types, are available on the market, and do not currently have development plans. Of the 24, the majority (19) are small sites under four acres in size, with 14 of these under two acres in size. Because only 82 acres of vacant land is available for development, consisting primarily of parcels four acres or less, development of the project at the proposed buildout intensity on infill parcels would be infeasible.

As the infill alternative would involve multiple small locations throughout the City, it does not meet the fundamental objectives of the City or the applicant to develop an integrated innovation center campus of approximately 200 acres in size, with sufficient land to meet demand over a 20 to 25 year period, and a critical mass of users of various sizes sufficient to support the necessary infrastructure and amenities to allow for a full range of research and market uses. Moreover, the City would not realize the benefits of an agglomeration of development, instead having a disconnected patchwork of development spread out in various sites. As a result, the City would be unlikely to capture a greater share of local and regional business growth.

Mixed-Use Alternative

The Mixed-Use Alternative includes the same non-residential square footage and land uses as the proposed project, but also includes up to 850 residential units as a part of the MRIC, intended to

support the innovation center's employee-generated demand for housing. This Alternative includes the proposed Mace Triangle component of the project. The same development assumptions, and mitigation measures, identified for the Mace Triangle in the Project Description chapter and technical sections of this EIR, would apply for the Mixed-Use Alternative.[2]

The Mixed Use Alternative would result in greater impacts than the proposed project related to BOD loading at the wastewater treatment plant and aesthetics related to increased building heights. However, as compared to the project, this Alternative will achieve reductions in daily VMT and GHG emissions, lower AM and PM peak hour vehicle trips, fewer impacts at Mace Boulevard, and elimination of impacts related to population and housing. Moreover, this alternative meets all of the objectives of the City and applicant. However because it includes housing, it is not consistent with the City's expressed goal of having only non-residential uses within the innovation center.

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."

A comparison of the proposed project to the project alternatives, discussed in detail above, is provided in Table 2-1, above. Although the No Project (No Build) Alternative would result in the fewest impacts in all resources areas compared to the proposed project, and all other alternatives even after accounting for anticipated mitigation measures, the No Project (No Build) Alternative would not satisfy any of the project objectives.

The next most environmentally superior alternative is the Reduced Project Alternative.[3] This alternative would result in less impact as compared to the project; however, it fails to achieve the fundamental objectives of the City or the applicant to develop an integrated innovation center

[2] The City property would be designated Public-Semi-Public to allow for the continuation of existing uses. New uses on the City property are not proposed. The Ikedas parcel and other agricultural parcel would be designated General Commercial to allow for the continuation or expansion of the existing agricultural retail (Ikedas market) and/or for the development of up to 71,056 sf of new commercial uses.

[3] For example, Fehr & Peers has concluded that two significant and unavoidable proposed project impacts would likely be eliminated under the Reduced Project Alternative, as follows: intersections within the Mace Boulevard Interchange Area (Impact 4.14-2), and local neighborhood street traffic (Impact 4.14-5). Also, with respect to air quality, this chapter has determined that the Reduced Project Alternative's criteria air pollutant emissions would be below the YSAQMD's thresholds of significance for ROG, NO_X, and PM_{10}. Therefore, the Reduced Project Alternative would avoid the proposed project's significant and unavoidable operational air quality impact (Impact 4.3-2). Other significant and unavoidable impacts avoided by the Reduced Project Alternative are those related to population and housing (Impact 4.12-1 and Impact 5-18). This is because this Alternative's reduced demand for employee housing with the City of Davis can be accommodated by the projected available housing stock within Davis.

campus of approximately 200 acres in size, with sufficient land to meet demand over a 20 to 25 year period, and a critical mass of users of various sizes sufficient to support the necessary infrastructure and amenities to allow for a full range of research and market uses.

The Reduced Site Size Alternative would also result in less impact overall as compared to the proposed project simply because the site size is reduced. This alternative would meet some of the objectives of the proposed project. However, the smaller site size would make it difficult to achieve a sufficient long term land supply for the full range of projected uses including those that require larger building footprints. The smaller site would double the intensity of development over the site, which would result in design challenges and may be too dense to attract some desirable R&D users. The ability to attract medium scale and large-scale users would be affected by the small footprint and there would be less flexibility in the user space to address the specific needs of some tenants as a result.

The most environmentally superior alternative that appears to best meet the project objectives is the Mixed Use Alternative. The Mixed Use Alternative would result in greater impacts than the proposed project related to BOD loading at the wastewater treatment plant and aesthetics related to increased building heights. However, as compared to the project, this alternative will achieve reductions in daily VMT and GHG emissions, lower AM and PM peak hour vehicle trips, fewer impacts at Mace Boulevard, and elimination of impacts related to population and housing (see Table 2-2). This alternative is thus environmentally superior and meets all of the objectives of the City and applicant. However, it should be noted that because it includes housing it is not consistent with the City's expressed goal of having only non-residential uses within the innovation center.

While the Mixed Use Alternative is identified as the Environmentally Superior alternative under CEQA, the ultimate decision regarding feasibility of the alternatives lies with the City Council. The Council will make findings regarding the desirability of the proposed project and the feasibility of each alternative. In their deliberations, the Council may consider the following related to the feasibility of each alternative:

- Attainment of Project Objectives
- Avoidance or Substantial Lessening of Significant Effects
- Suitability of Alternative Sites or Site Layouts
- Economic Viability
- Availability of Infrastructure
- General Plan Consistency
- Other Plans or Regulatory Limitations
- Jurisdictional Boundaries/Regional Context
- Property Ownership and Control
- Other Reasons for Rejecting as Infeasible

An assessment of how these factors apply to each alternative will be prepared for the Council to consider and adopt at the time final action is taken on the project.

Table 2-2
Mixed-Use Alternative in Comparison to the Proposed Project
Environmental Benefits vs. Increased Impacts

Environmental Benefits			
	Proposed Project	**Mixed-Use Alternative**	**Comments**
VMT (daily)	196,000	139,000	Mixed-Use Alt reduces daily VMT by approx. 29%.
AM Peak Hour Trips	2,361 (+92 for Mace Triangle)	1,480 (+92 for Mace Triangle)	Mixed-Use Alt reduces AM peak hour trips by approx. 37%.
PM Peak Hour Trips	2,175 (+87 for Mace Triangle)	1,435 (+87 for Mace Triangle)	Mixed-Use Alt reduces PM peak hour trips by approx. 34%.
Annual GHG Emissions (Mitigated)	26,043 MTCO2e/yr	22,128 MTCO2e/yr	Mixed-Use Alt reduces annual GHG emissions by approx. 15%.
Project-Level Impacts to Intersections within the Mace Boulevard Interchange Area	Three Mace interchange intersections impacted by proposed project traffic. Impact is significant and unavoidable.	No Mace interchange intersections impacted. Impact is less-than-significant.	The three intersections impacted by proposed project are: 1. Mace Boulevard/I-80 Westbound Ramps 2. Mace Boulevard/2nd Street/CR 32A 3. Mace Boulevard/Alhambra Drive
Project-Level and Cumulative Population and Housing Impacts	Impact is significant and unavoidable.	Impact is less-than-significant.	For the proposed project, City of Davis cannot fully meet its projected share of MRIC employee housing demand, possibly resulting in increased urbanization pressures for the City of Davis environs and/or the need to accommodate this unmet demand within neighboring jurisdictions. For the Mixed-Use Alt, the unmet demand for employee housing in Davis, resulting from the innovation center, will be provided on-site.
Increased Impacts			
	Proposed Project	**Mixed-Use Alternative**	**Comments**
Wastewater (Average Dry Weather BOD[1] Load)	440 lbs/day	700 lbs/day	Proposed Project BOD impact to the City's WWTP is less-than-significant. Mixed-Use Alt BOD impact to the WWTP is significant, thus requiring mitigation.
Aesthetics (i.e., Building Heights)	R&D Max Height: 55 ft Hotel Max Height: 75 ft	R&D Max Height: 65 ft Hotel and Housing Max Height: 85 ft.	For the Mixed-Use Alt, over 50% of the site will contain taller buildings. Though, the magnitude of the building heights will be less for the proposed project, impacts associated with change in visual character of the site will be SU for both the proposed project and the Mixed-Use Alt.

[1] (BOD) Biochemical Oxygen Demand

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. The discussion below goes beyond identification of impacts expected to result from implementation of the project, and identifies issues to be resolved known from workshops and other public discussion of the project. At this time, these known areas include the following (in no order):

- Agricultural land conversion – The project would convert land being used primarily for agriculture and agriculturally related uses to urban uses.
- Bicycle and pedestrian connections – The project would add vehicle trips onto CR 32A which has existing safety concerns for bicyclists in the area, particularly those traveling CR 32A to commute to Sacramento.
- City-owned 25 acres – The project includes a 25-acre parcel owned by the City and the subject of interest for a community farm.
- Fiscal and Economic Impacts – The project would result in fiscal and economic costs and benefits that do not get addressed in an EIR. The City has a separate analysis of these issues underway and anticipates release of a report in early September.
- Growth-inducing impacts – The project as proposed would result in thousands of jobs without providing housing.
- Height and design – The project proposes heights that range from 45 feet to 75 feet.
- Intensity/Density – The project proposes a 0.5 floor area ratio which is at the low end of the City's identified objective for intensity/density of the project.
- Mixed Use – The project does not include residential uses but one of the alternative examined in this EIR does.
- Need for the Project – The City has done extensive study supporting the conclusion that there is no site or combination of sites available inside the city that would support the desired innovation center.
- Size of the project – The City has undertaken analysis that supports a minimum size of approximately 200 acres for the desired innovation center.
- Sustainability – The project proposes various sustainability features most notably generation of 50 percent of needed energy onsite.
- Visual character – The project would convert land highly visible from I-80 and located on the east side of Mace Boulevard to urban uses.

TABLE 2-3
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 Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.1-2 Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the project site and its surroundings.	S	*None feasible.*	SU
4.1-3 Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	PS	*MRIC and Mace Triangle* *4.1-3 In conjunction with submittal of improvement plans for the Mace Triangle and each phase of development for the MRIC, the applicant shall submit a lighting plan to the Community Development and Sustainability Department for review and approval. The lighting plan shall be designed to limit light trespass and glare onto off-site properties to a reasonable level through the use of shielding, and directional lighting methods, including, but not limited to, fixture location and height. The Plan shall comply with Chapter 6 of the Davis Municipal Code - Article 8: Outdoor Lighting Control.*	LS
4.1-4 Conflict, or create inconsistency, with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects related to aesthetics and	PS	*MRIC and Mace Triangle* *4.1-4 At or prior to final planned development, or tentative map submittal, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall submit landscape and architectural details to the Department of Community Development and Sustainability showing the following:*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
visual resources.		*Landscaping* • *Research/office/R&D and manufacturing areas shall have access connections at regular intervals along the perimeter of the project area to adjacent bike and pedestrian pathways and easily-accessible, landscaped pedestrian and bicycle access between various areas.* • *Arterial and collection streets shall have planted medians, but with widths sized to accommodate tree and shrub plantings. Medians on collector streets shall be limited to locations where the median contributes to a specific purpose or solves a specific problem, such as enhancing an entry, calming traffic, or providing a needed pedestrian refuge at intersections. Removal of street trees to accommodate an increase in vehicular traffic shall occur only as a last resort, after review by appropriate boards and commissions.* • *Trees that are planted in the future shall have wide canopies, sufficient to eventually provide, at maturity, at least 50 percent shade coverage of the pavement area of local streets and 30 percent shade coverage of the pavement area of collector and arterial streets.*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Architecture • *A scale transition between intensified land uses and adjoining lower intensity land uses shall be provided, as applicable.* • *Taller buildings shall be stepped back at upper levels in areas with a relatively smaller-scale character.* • *Buildings shall be varied in size, density and design.* • *Stored materials, goods, parts or equipment shall be screened from adjacent public streets or highways.* • *Loading facilities shall be designed as an integral part of the building(s) which they serve and shall be located in an inconspicuous manner.* • *Roof mounted equipment shall be screened from view of any ground level area accessible to the general public.* • *Trash enclosures, noise generating equipment, and other nuisances shall be adequately screened or located away from any adjacent residential use.*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.2 Agricultural and Forest Resources				
4.2-1	**Impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Important Farmlands) to non-agricultural use, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency.**	S	*MRIC Site* *4.2-1(a)* *Prior to initiation of grading activities for each phase of development of the MRIC, the project applicant for the MRIC Site shall set aside in perpetuity, at a minimum ratio of 2:1 of active agricultural acreage, an amount equal to the current phase. The applicant may choose to set aside in perpetuity an amount equal to the remainder of the project site instead of at each phase. The agricultural land shall be elsewhere in unincorporated Yolo County, through the purchase of development rights and execution of an irreversible conservation or agricultural easement, consistent with Section 40A.03.025 of the Davis Municipal Code. The location and amount of active agricultural acreage for the proposed project is subject to the review and approval by the City Council. The amount of agricultural acreage set aside shall account for farmland lost due to the conversion of the project site, as well as any off-site improvements, including but not necessarily limited to the off-site sewer pipe, and 400-feet along the north and east property line unless a "no aerial spray" easement is purchased. The amount of agricultural acreage that needs to be set aside for off-site improvements shall be verified for each phase of the MRIC during improvement plan review. Pursuant to Davis Code Section*	SU

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		40A.03.040, the agricultural mitigation land shall be comparable in soil quality with the agricultural land being changed to nonagricultural use. The easement land must conform with the policies and requirements of LAFCO including a LESA score no more than 10 percent below that of the project site. The easement instrument used to satisfy this measure shall conform to the conservation easement template of the Yolo Habitat Conservancy.	
		4.2-1(b) The MRIC Master Owners' Association (MOA) shall encourage, and exercise control over, interim agricultural operations on-site through specific terms of agricultural leases. Terms shall specify duration of leases and require each new leasee to coordinate with the Yolo County Agricultural Commissioner to determine appropriate types of agricultural crops and uses for urban/ag interface areas. The MOA shall work cooperatively with the farmer(s) to minimize incompatibilities between ongoing agricultural operations on-site and MRIC businesses, such that the project site can continue to be farmed successfully until the project is fully built out. Minimization measures should include the appropriate timing of on-site agricultural operations (i.e., use of equipment) to avoid early morning or nighttime noise generation; prohibiting disking operations during periods of high winds; minimization of pesticide applications; etc.	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Mace Triangle – none	
4.2-2 Impacts related to conflicting with existing zoning for agricultural use.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.2-3 Result in the loss of forest or agricultural land or conversion of forest or agricultural land to non-forest or non-agricultural use.	S	*MRIC Site* *4.2-3(a) Implement Mitigation Measures 4.2-1(a) and (b).* *Mace Triangle Site* *4.2-3(b) Prior to initiation of grading activities for APN 033-630-012 or APN 033-630-011 within the Mace Triangle site, the future project applicant(s) shall set aside in perpetuity, at a minimum ratio of 2:1 of active agricultural acreage, the following approximate acreages of protected farmland for agricultural purposes:* • *APN 033-630-011 (Ikedas):* *Mitigate conversion of approx. 2.5 acres at a 2:1 ratio = 5 acres* • *APN 033-630-012 (Easternmost Parcel):* *Mitigate conversion of approx. 8.4 acres at a 2:1 ratio = 16.8 acres*	SU

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		The agricultural land shall be elsewhere in unincorporated Yolo County, through the purchase of development rights and execution of an irreversible conservation or agricultural easement, consistent with Section 40A.03.025 of the Davis Municipal Code. The location and amount of active agricultural acreage for the proposed project is subject to the review and approval by the City Council. The amount of agricultural acreage set aside shall account for farmland lost due to the conversion of the project site as well as any off-site improvements. Pursuant to Davis Code Section 40A.03.040, the agricultural mitigation land shall be comparable in soil quality with the agricultural land whose use is being changed to nonagricultural use. The easement land must conform with the policies and requirements of LAFCO including a LESA score no more than 10 percent below that of the project site. The easement instrument used to satisfy this measure shall conform to the conservation easement template of the Yolo Habitat Conservancy.	
4.2-4 Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.	S	*MRIC* *4.2-4* *Prior to recording the first final map, the applicant shall attempt to purchase a "no aerial spray" easement from the adjacent property owner. It is anticipated that the easement will need to be 400 feet wide along the MRIC Site's northern and eastern boundaries. The applicant shall submit the written proof of the easement to the*	SU

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Department of Community Development and Sustainability. *Mace Triangle – none*	
4.2-5 Conflict, or create an inconsistency, with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects related to agricultural resources.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.3 Air Quality			
4.3-1 Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation during construction.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.3-2 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.	S	*MRIC and Mace Triangle* *4.3-2 Prior to issuance of any building permits, the project applicant shall show on project plans via notation that only zero-VOC paints, finishes, adhesives, and cleaning supplies shall be used for all buildings on the project site. Project plans shall be subject to review and approval by the Department of Community Development and Sustainability.*	SU

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.3-3 Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.3-4 Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.3-5 Conflict, or create an inconsistency, with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects related to air quality.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.4 Biological Resources			
4.4-1 Impacts to Special-status plant species.	PS	*MRIC and Mace Triangle* *4.4-1 To ensure avoidance and minimization of potential impacts to special-status plant species, the following measures shall be implemented:* • *Prior to initiation of any ground disturbance activities for the Mace Triangle and for each phase of the MRIC, the applicant shall retain a qualified botanist to conduct a botanical survey during spring (April to May) and fall (July to September), during the evident and identifiable periods for special-status plants with potential to occur on the site. The*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		botanical survey must also cover all potential utility line alignments and any other off-site work required for any phase of development. The survey shall be submitted to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability for review. • *Any special-status plants that are within the limits of grading for on- or off-site improvements shall be propagated to suitable habitat in designated open space areas, or for the Mace Triangle, another pre-approved location. The propagation shall be overseen by a qualified botanist, approved by the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability and CDFW. The botanist shall identify the location to receive the plants, identify the methods of propagation, and oversee the work.*	
4.4-2 Impacts to Valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB).	PS	*MRIC* *4.4-2(a)* *To ensure avoidance and minimization of impacts to VELB, the project applicant for the MRIC shall implement the following measures prior to initiation of any ground disturbance activities within the Phase 3 portion of the MRIC along Mace Boulevard:* • *The project applicant for the MRIC shall avoid the single elderberry shrub along Mace Boulevard by*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		restricting all construction and ground-disturbance during Phase 3 of development within 20 feet from the dripline of the shrub, subject to inspection by the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability. Restriction would include installing temporary orange fencing around the dripline so the area is clearly visible to workers; or • *If the shrub cannot be avoided during Phase 3 through re-design as determined by the City of Davis Public Works Department in conjunction with the project applicant, the project applicant shall mitigate for potential impacts to the shrub by either (1) purchasing VELB conservation credits from a USFWS-approved conservation bank, or (2) transplanting the individual shrub that is not avoided to a suitable mitigation site in a manner consistent with the USFWS' 1999 Conservation Guidelines for the VELB. The mitigation shall be overseen by a qualified biologist, approved by the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability and USFWS.* *4.4-2(b)* *To ensure avoidance and minimization of impacts to VELB, the project applicant for the MRIC shall implement the following measures, prior to initiation of ground disturbance activities, if the northerly off-site sewer alignment is selected by the project applicant:*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		• *The project applicant for the MRIC shall avoid the elderberry shrubs along County Road 104 by restricting all construction and ground-disturbance within 20 feet from the dripline of the shrubs, subject to inspection by the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability. Restriction would include installing temporary orange fencing around the dripline so the area is clearly visible to workers; or* • *If the shrubs cannot be avoided in such a fashion, the project applicant shall mitigate for potential impacts to the shrubs by either (1) purchasing VELB conservation credits from a USFWS-approved conservation bank, or (2) transplanting the individual shrubs that are not avoided to a suitable mitigation site in a manner consistent with the USFWS' 1999 Conservation Guidelines for the VELB. The mitigation shall be overseen by a qualified biologist, approved by the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability and USFWS.* *Mace Triangle site - none*	
4.4-3 Impacts to Giant garter snake (GGS).	PS	*MRIC* *4.4-3(a) To ensure avoidance and minimization of impacts to GGS, the project applicant for the MRIC shall*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		implement the following measures: *Mace Drainage Channel – Preconstruction Surveys* • *Within 15 days prior to conducting any work in the Mace Drainage Channel or existing on-site detention basin, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a preconstruction survey to verify that no water is present in the channel within the project limits. The preconstruction survey shall be submitted to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability for review.* • *The qualified biologist shall document whether aquatic habitat is present in the Mace Drainage Channel downstream of the MRIC site. If aquatic habitat is not present in the Channel between the MRIC site and CR 105 (a distance of 0.5 miles), then aquatic habitat connectivity is not present in the Mace Drainage Channel and further preconstruction surveys or construction monitoring is not required.* • *If water is present within the on- and off-site project limits, the Mace Drainage Channel shall be dewatered for a minimum of two weeks prior to construction activities in the Channel.* • *If the first preconstruction survey reveals that*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		aquatic habitat is present in the Channel between the project site and CR 105, a second preconstruction survey shall be conducted within 24 hours prior to construction. The second preconstruction survey shall be submitted to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability for review. The second preconstruction survey shall cover the portion of the Mace Drainage Channel located on the MRIC site, and areas within 200 feet of the channel. If, based on the preconstruction surveys, it is determined that potentially occupied GGS aquatic habitat occurs within 200 feet of the MRIC site, MM 4.4-3(b) shall be implemented. *If GGS are encountered during preconstruction surveys, USFWS and CDFW shall be notified and construction shall not commence until the following avoidance measures approved by USFWS and CDFW are implemented.* o *Unless authorized by USFWS, site disturbance or construction activity within 200 feet of suitable aquatic habitat for the GGS shall not commence before May 1, with initial ground disturbance expected to correspond with the snake's active season. Initial ground disturbance should be completed by October 1.* o *To the extent possible, site disturbance or*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		construction activity shall be avoided within 200 feet from the banks of GGS aquatic habitat for any phase of development. Movement of heavy equipment in these areas shall be confined to existing roadways, where feasible, to minimize habitat disturbance. o *Construction personnel shall receive USFWS-approved worker environmental awareness training to instruct workers to recognize giant garter snake and their habitats.* o *Within 24 hours before site disturbance or construction activity, the project area shall be surveyed for GGS. The survey shall be repeated if a lapse in construction activity of two weeks or greater has occurred. If a GGS is encountered during construction, activities shall cease until appropriate corrective measures have been completed or it is determined by the qualified biologist and City staff, in coordination with USFWS and CDFW, that the GGS will not be harmed. Any sightings or incidental take shall be reported to USFWS and CDFW immediately.* o *Any aquatic habitat for the snake that is dewatered shall remain dry for at least 15 consecutive days after April 15 and before excavating or filling of the dewatered habitat. If complete dewatering is not possible, potential*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		snake prey (e.g., fish and tadpoles) shall be removed so that snakes and other wildlife are not attracted to the construction area. o *GGS habitat to be avoided within or adjacent to construction areas shall be fenced and designated as environmentally sensitive areas. These areas shall be avoided by all construction personnel throughout construction for any phase of development.* *Off-Site Volume Storage Pond (if approved)* • *During the inactive season (October 2 to April 30), no work shall be conducted in areas within 200 feet of potential aquatic habitat for GGS, unless authorized by USFWS.* • *Temporary stockpiling of soil shall not occur within 200 feet of potential aquatic habitat for GGS.* • *During the active season (May 1 to October 1), the construction monitoring provision of MM 4.4-3(b) shall be implemented and a biological monitor shall be present during work within 200 feet of aquatic habitat for GGS.* *4.4-3(b) Construction Monitoring* • *If any work is to occur within 200 feet of GGS*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		aquatic habitat, then a biological monitor trained in GGS identification shall be on-site during any work within or immediately adjacent to the Mace Drainage Channel. The monitor shall provide environmental training to construction personnel working in or near the Mace Drainage Channel, subject to inspection by the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability. The training shall include instruction on GGS identification, behavior, and habitat. Work shall be stopped and USFWS and CDFW contacted should any GGS be encountered. *Mace Triangle – none*	
4.4-4 Impacts to Burrowing owl.	PS	*MRIC* *4.4-4(a)* <u>*Preconstruction Surveys:*</u> *The project applicant proposing development on the MRIC site shall implement the following measure to avoid or minimize impacts to western burrowing owl:* • *No less than 14 days prior to any ground disturbing activities for any phase of development at the MRIC Site, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a preconstruction survey of the MRIC site, any off-site improvement areas, and all publicly accessible potential burrowing owl habitat*	LS

TABLE 2-3
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 MRIC site, further mitigation is not required. The preconstruction 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 preconstruction 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 preconstruction 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 breeding season (16 April to 30*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		August), a minimum of three preconstruction 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 preconstruction survey will be conducted annually.* • *If active burrowing owl dens are found within the survey area in an area where disturbance would occur, the project applicant shall 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 with the approval of CDFW. Advance planning with CDFW would be necessary prior to*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		the initiation of the take avoidance survey to plan for contingencies in the event that owls are present on-site. *4.4-4(b)* <u>*Compensatory Mitigation, if Active Owl Dens are Present:*</u> *If active burrowing owl dens are present and the project would impact active dens, the project applicant shall implement the following:* • *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 consistent with the March 7, 2012, CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. Such mitigation may include the permanent protection of land, which is deemed to be suitable burrowing owl 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.* *If the same mitigation acreage would be utilized for multiple species (i.e. burrowing owl habitat and Swainson's hawk foraging habitat), the appropriate wildlife agency, in this case CDFW, must approve the mitigation lands and long-term management*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		practices for the mitigation lands as suitable and compatible for all species for which the lands are to provide compensatory mitigation. Proof of CDFW's approval habitat "stacking" shall be provided to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability. *Mace Triangle Site* *4.4-4(c)* <u>Preconstruction Surveys:</u> *The project applicant proposing development on the Mace Triangle site shall implement the following measures to avoid or minimize impacts to western burrowing owl:* • *No less than 14 days prior to any ground disturbing activities for any phase of development at the Mace Triangle site, the project applicant shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a preconstruction survey of the Mace Triangle site, any off-site improvement areas, and all publicly accessible potential burrowing owl habitat 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 Mace Triangle Site, further mitigation is not required. The preconstruction survey shall be*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		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 preconstruction 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 preconstruction 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 breeding season (16 April to 30 August), a minimum of three preconstruction 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*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		June. • *If active burrowing owl dens are found within the survey area in an area where disturbance would occur, the project applicant shall 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 with the approval of CDFW. Advance planning with CDFW would be necessary prior to the initiation of the take avoidance survey to plan for contingencies in the event that owls are present on-site.* *4.4-4(d)* *<u>Compensatory Mitigation, if Active Owl Dens are Present:</u> If active burrowing owl dens are present and the project would impact active dens, the project applicant shall implement the following:* • *If active owl burrows are present and the project would impact active burrows, the project applicant*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		shall provide compensatory mitigation for the permanent loss of burrowing owl habitat consistent with the March 7, 2012 CDFW's Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. Such mitigation may include the permanent protection of land that is deemed to be suitable burrowing owl 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. If the same mitigation acreage would be utilized for multiple species (i.e. burrowing owl habitat and Swainson's hawk foraging habitat), the appropriate wildlife agency, in this case CDFW, must approve the mitigation lands and long-term management practices for the mitigation lands as suitable and compatible for all species for which the lands are to provide compensatory mitigation. Proof of CDFW's approval habitat "stacking" shall be provided to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability.	
4.4-5 Impacts to Swainson's hawk.	S	*MRIC* *4.4-5(a)* <u>*Preconstruction Nesting Surveys:*</u> *To ensure avoidance and minimization of impacts to Swainson's hawk nesting, the project applicant shall implement the*	SU

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		following measures: • *If site disturbance or construction activity for any phase of development is proposed during the nesting season for Swainson's hawk (March 1 through September 15), a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for Swainson's hawk in accordance with the May 2000 Recommended Timing and Methodology for Swainson's Hawk Nesting Surveys in California's Central Valley prepared by the Swainson's Hawk Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) as applicable. In accordance with the TAC guidelines, to meet the minimum level of protection for Swainson's hawk, three surveys shall be completed in each of the two survey periods immediately prior to project initiation (with the exception that surveys shall not be initiated in period IV). The preconstruction survey shall be submitted to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability for review.* • *The preconstruction survey shall include the project construction footprint and publicly accessible areas within 0.25-mile. Inaccessible areas shall be surveyed with binoculars from publicly accessible areas. If active Swainson's hawk nests are not found, further action is not necessary.*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		• *If an active Swainson's hawk nest is found within 0.25-mile of the MRIC site but is effectively shielded from view of the site by structures and/ or vegetation, then with approval from CDFW, construction may commence.* • *If an active nest located within 0.25-mile of the MRIC site is within line-of-sight of the MRIC site, then in consultation with CDFW, a biologist experienced with raptor behavior shall monitor the nest for signs of disturbance. Work may be allowed to proceed if the Swainson's hawks are not exhibiting agitated behavior. The biologist shall be on-site daily while construction related activities are taking place and shall have the authority to stop work if the Swainson's hawks are exhibiting agitated behavior. In coordination with CDFW, monitoring may be reduced if the on-site biologist determines that construction is not disturbing the Swainson's hawks or determines that they have become acclimated to construction activities.* • *If the Swainson's hawk is showing agitated behavior, then construction shall cease or be reduced to a point that does not disturb the hawks. Construction may resume after the nesting season, or in coordination with CDFW, later in the nesting season when Swainson's hawks are less prone to disturbance.*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		4.4-5(b) *Foraging Habitat: The project applicant shall permanently protect an equivalent amount of acres of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat converted by the proposed project by either (1) purchasing a DFW-approved conservation easement of like acreage or (2) paying the requisite mitigation fee to the Yolo Habitat JPA pursuant to the Swainson's Hawk Interim Mitigation Fee Program or purchasing mitigation credits from an approved mitigation credit holder. Purchase of a conservation easement of like acreage or payment of the mitigation fee shall be made to the Yolo Habitat JPA and shall be confirmed by the City prior to the initiation of ground disturbing activities.* *Mace Triangle* *4.4-5(c)* *Foraging Habitat: The project applicant shall permanently protect an equivalent amount of acres of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat converted by the proposed project by either (1) purchasing a DFW-approved conservation easement of like acreage or (2) paying the requisite mitigation fee to the Yolo Habitat JPA pursuant to the Swainson's Hawk Interim Mitigation Fee Program or purchasing mitigation credits from an approved mitigation credit holder. Purchase of a conservation easement of like acreage or payment of the mitigation fee shall be made to the Yolo Habitat JPA and shall be confirmed by the City prior to*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		the initiation of ground disturbing activities.	
4.4-6 Impacts to raptors, nesting birds, or other birds protected under the MBTA.	PS	*MRIC* *4.4-6 The project applicant for the MRIC shall implement the following measures to avoid or minimize impacts to Migratory Birds and other protected 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 needed.* • *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 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 250-foot radius for birds of prey. If an active nest of a bird of prey, MBTA bird, or other CDFW-protected bird is not found, then no further mitigation measures are necessary. The preconstruction survey shall be submitted to the City of Davis Department of Community Development*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		and Sustainability for review. • *If an active nest of a bird of prey, MBTA bird, or other CDFW-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.* o *The biologist shall establish a minimum 250-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. No work may occur within the ESA until the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active.* *Mace Triangle – none*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4-7	**Have a substantial effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS.**	PS	*MRIC* *4.4-7 The project applicant for the MRIC shall implement the following measure to avoid or minimize impacts to the Mace Drainage Channel:* • *Prior to conducting work within the bed and banks in the Mace Drainage Channel for any phase of development, as applicable, the project applicant for the MRIC shall notify CDFW pursuant to Section 1602 of the Fish and Wildlife Code. If CDFW determines that a Streambed Alteration Agreement (SAA) is necessary, the applicant shall obtain a SAA and comply with all conditions of that Agreement. Compliance with the SAA shall be ensured by the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability. This does not apply to City maintenance work within the Mace Drainage Channel, for which the City already has an agreement with CDFW.* *Mace Triangle – none.*	LS
4.4-8	**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,**	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	hydrological interruption, or other means.			
4.4-9	**Interfere substantially with the movement of native, resident, or migratory fish or wildlife species or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.4-10	**Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.4-11	**Conflict with an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.**	PS	*MRIC Site and Mace Triangle Site* *4.4-11 Should the Yolo Natural Heritage Program (YNHP) be adopted prior to initiation of any ground disturbing activities for any phase of development associated with the MRIC or Mace Triangle, the project applicant shall comply with the mitigation/conservation requirements of the YNHP, as applicable. The project applicant, the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability, and a representative from the YNHP JPA shall ensure that all mitigation/conservation requirements of the YNHP 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 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.4-12 Conflict, or create an inconsistency, with any applicable biological resources plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	PS	*MRIC* *4.4-12 At or prior to final planned development, or tentative map submittal, whichever occurs first, the applicant shall submit a design plan for the proposed on-site buffer/drainage features to the Department of Community Development and Sustainability for review and approval. The design plan shall demonstrate how the buffer/drainage features will be wildlife friendly natural spaces, with respect to details such as plant types, detention slopes, etc. In addition, should staff determine that in order to meet the City's stated objectives for urban agricultural transition areas (UATA), as well as drainage and safety, the proposed buffer design shall be modified to concentrate the proposed buffer and drainage areas to the northern and eastern boundaries of the project site, in order to establish wider UATA segments.* *Mace Triangle – none*	LS
4.5 Cultural Resources			
4.5-1 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.	PS	*MRIC* *4.5-1 If the northerly off-site sewer alignment is selected for the MRIC, then prior to approval of design-level improvement plans for the off-site sewer pipe, the applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist to design*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		and implement a cultural study, the intent of which shall be to identify and investigate any subsurface historic remains within the northerly portion of the sewer pipe construction limits. Because of the potential for fragile prehistoric remains within this area, the evaluation shall include only metal detection and hand excavation. Metal detection should include a complete sweep of the APE adjacent to the farm structures, to test for subsurface features. Hand excavation should include testing of the metal detection finds. If no subsurface features are uncovered, no additional cultural investigations will necessary. If, on the other hand, structural remains are found, the investigation shall continue as formal evaluation to determine their eligibility for the California Register of Historical Resources. This shall include, at a minimum, additional exposure of the feature(s), and photo-documentation and recordation. If the evaluation determines that the features do not have sufficient data potential to be eligible for the California Register, no additional work should be required. However, if data potential exists – e.g., there is an intact feature – it will be necessary to mitigate any project impacts. The evaluation shall be submitted to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability for review. *If it is determined that standing structures associated with the William Seward Wright house and farm are*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		within, or immediately adjacent to, the off-site sewer APE, a qualified architectural historian shall conduct an evaluation of those structures for their potential eligibility for the California Register of Historical Resources. The evaluation should include a full assessment of the structures, archival research to confirm the age, occupants, and historic uses of the structures, and the dates and extent of any renovations that might impact the structures' historic integrity. Should the structures be determined to be eligible for the California Register, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852, any mitigation measures provided in the architectural historian's report shall be followed. Should the structures be determined ineligible for the California Register, no further consideration shall be required. The evaluation shall be submitted to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability for review. *Mitigation of impacts might include avoidance of further disturbance to the resources through project redesign. If avoidance is determined to be infeasible, additional data recovery excavations shall be conducted for the resources, to collect enough information to exhaust the data potential of those resources. Impacts to the standing structures shall be mitigated through recordation to the standards of the National Park*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Service's Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), as determined by the qualified architectural historian. *Mace Triangle – none*	
4.5-2 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5	PS	*MRIC* *4.5-2(a) Prior to approval of any improvement plans for development within the northwestern corner of the MRIC site (i.e., the area designated as having "high" sensitivity for buried sites per Figure 7 of the "Archaeological Survey Report for the Proposed Davis Innovation Center: Mace Ranch Location", prepared by Far Western Anthropological Research Group), the applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist to design and implement an archeological study, the intent of which shall be to identify and investigate any subsurface archaeological remains within the northwestern portion of the MRIC site. The subsurface sampling methodology outlined in the study shall be sufficient to enable the qualified archaeologist to define the physical extent and nature of any artifact-bearing deposits should they be discovered. Because of the potential for fragile prehistoric remains, the evaluation should include only hand excavation. Hand excavation should include placement of a series of small shovel probes across the site to look for prehistoric artifacts and features. If artifact-bearing deposits are not uncovered, additional cultural investigations are not required. If artifact-*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		bearing features are found, the investigation shall continue as formal evaluation to determine their eligibility for the California Register of Historical Resources. This shall include, at a minimum, hand excavation of larger control units and analysis of the artifact assemblage(s). If the evaluation determines that the artifacts 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., there is an intact feature with a large and varied artifact assemblage – necessary mitigation measures shall be implemented to alleviate any project impacts. The evaluation shall be submitted to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability for review. *Mitigation of impacts might include avoidance of further disturbance to the resources through project redesign. If redesign is not feasible, additional data recovery excavations shall be conducted for the archaeological resources, to collect enough information to exhaust the data potential of those resources.*	
		4.5-2(b) *If the northerly off-site sewer alignment is selected for the MRIC, then prior to approval of design-level improvement plans for the off-site sewer pipe, the applicant shall retain a qualified archaeologist to design and implement an archeological study, the intent of*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		which shall be to identify and investigate any subsurface archaeological remains within the northerly portion of the sewer pipe construction limits. The subsurface sampling methodology outlined in the study shall be sufficient to enable the qualified archaeologist to define the physical extent and nature of any artifact-bearing deposits should they be discovered. Because of the potential for fragile prehistoric remains, the evaluation should include only hand excavation. Hand excavation should include placement of a series of small shovel probes across the site to look for prehistoric artifacts and features. If artifact-bearing deposits are not uncovered, additional archaeological investigations are not required. If artifact-bearing features are found, the investigation shall continue as formal evaluation to determine their eligibility for the California Register of Historical Resources. This shall include, at a minimum, hand excavation of larger control units and analysis of the artifact assemblage(s). If the evaluation determines that the artifacts 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., there is an intact feature with a large and varied artifact assemblage – necessary mitigation measures shall be implemented to alleviate any project impacts. The evaluation shall be submitted to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability for review.	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Mitigation of impacts might include avoidance of further disturbance to the resources through project redesign. If redesign is not feasible, additional data recovery excavations shall be conducted for the archaeological resources, to collect enough information to exhaust the data potential of those resources. *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *4.5-2(c)* *If any prehistoric or historic artifacts, or other indications of archaeological resources are found during grading and construction activities, all work within the vicinity of the find shall cease 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 finds. If the resource is determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources and project impacts cannot be avoided, data recovery shall be undertaken. 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. This language of this mitigation measure shall be included on any future grading plans,*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		utility plans, and subdivision improvement drawings approved by the City for the 212-acre MRIC site and/or 16.49-acre Mace Triangle site.	
4.5-3 Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature on the project site.	PS	*MRIC and Mace Triangle* *4.5-3 If any vertebrate bones or teeth are found by the construction crew, the contractor shall cease all work in the immediate vicinity of the discovery until an on-site archaeological monitor, if present, inspects the discovery; if none is present, or if recommended by the monitor, a professional paleontologist shall evaluate the find. If deemed 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., UCMP), where it will 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 the 212-acre MRIC site and/or 16.49-acre Mace Triangle site, where excavation work will be required.*	LS
4.5-4 Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	PS	*MRIC and Mace Triangle* *4.5-4 During construction, if bone is uncovered that may be human, the California Native American Heritage Commission, located in Sacramento, and the Yolo County Coroner shall be notified. Should human*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		remains be found, all work shall be halted until final disposition by the Coroner. Should the remains be determined to be of Native American descent, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be consulted to determine the appropriate disposition of such remains.	
4.5-5 Conflict, or create an inconsistency, with any applicable cultural resources plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.6 Geology, Soils, and Mineral Resources			
4.6-1 Risks to people and structures associated with seismic activity, including ground shaking and ground failure.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.6-2 Result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.	PS	*MRIC and Mace Triangle* *4.6-2 Prior to initiation of any grading activities for each phase of development of the MRIC or Mace Triangle, the project proponent shall submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to the RWQCB in accordance with the NPDES General Construction Permit requirements. The SWPPP shall be designed to control pollutant discharges utilizing Best Management Practices*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		(BMPs) and technology to reduce erosion and sediments. BMPs may consist of a wide variety of measures taken to reduce pollutants in stormwater runoff from the project site. Measures shall include temporary erosion control measures (such as silt fences, staked straw bales/wattles, silt/sediment basins and traps, check dams, geofabric, sandbag dikes, and temporary revegetation or other groundcover) that will be employed to control erosion from disturbed areas. Final selection of BMPs will be subject to approval by the City of Davis and the RWQCB. The SWPPP will be kept on site during construction activity and will be made available upon request to representatives of the RWQCB.	
4.6-3 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 lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.	PS	*MRIC* *4.6-3(a)* *Prior to final design approval and issuance of building permits for each phase of the MRIC, the project applicant shall submit to the City of Davis Building Inspection Division, for review and approval, a design-level geotechnical engineering report produced by a California Registered Civil Engineer or Geotechnical Engineer. The report shall include the recommendations in the report entitled Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Report, Mace Ranch Innovation Center, dated January 20, 2015 unless it is determined in the design-level report that one or more recommendations need to be revised. The design-level*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		report shall address, at a minimum, the following: • *Compaction specifications and subgrade preparation for on-site soils;* • *Structural foundations, including retaining wall design (if applicable);* • *Grading practices; and* • *Expansive/unstable soils, including fill.* *Design-level recommendations shall be included in the foundation and improvement plans and approved by the Davis Public Works Department prior to issuance of any building permits.* *Mace Triangle* *4.6-3(b)* *Prior to final design approval and issuance of building permits for future on-site development, the future project applicant for the Mace Triangle site shall submit a site-specific, design-level geotechnical report produced by a California Registered Geotechnical Engineer to the City of Davis Building Inspection Division for review and approval. The geotechnical report shall include, but would not be limited to, an analysis of the on-site geologic and seismic conditions, including soil sampling and testing. Recommendations shall be included regarding project design measures to*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		avoid risks to people and structures, including compliance with the latest CBC regulations, structural foundations, and grading practices.	
4.6-4 Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 118-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property.	PS	*MRIC* *4.6-4(a) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.6-3(a).* *Mace Triangle* *4.6-4(b) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.6-3(b).*	LS
4.6-5 Conflict, or create an inconsistency, with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects related to geology, soils, and mineral resources.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy			
4.7-1 Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.	S	*None feasible.*	SU
4.7-2 Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of	S	*MRIC and Mace Triangle* *4.7-2(a) Each individual development of the proposed project, shall demonstrate consistency with the City's Climate*	SU

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
GHGs.		*Action and Adaptation Plan by achieving a downward trajectory in GHG emissions, towards the City goal of zero net GHG emissions by the year 2050. The project must achieve the target in place for the year in which the application is filed.* *At the City's discretion, compliance with this mitigation measure for different development activities associated with the same approval may occur at different stages in the development process depending on the nature of the project and may be based on the year that physical improvements are anticipated. At the time of or before building permits are issued, the applicant must demonstrate reduction of GHG emissions consistent with this measure. Mitigation for buildings shall occur at the time the building permit is issued, and the amount of mitigation shall be based on the year the building permit is issued. Mitigation for other emissions from a project may occur at an earlier approval but no later than issuance of entitlements. The applicant may file and City may consider and approve a GHG mitigation plan that lays out the mitigation for different stages of development within the same subsequent project approval.* *Prior to issuance of any subsequent entitlement or permit in the MRIC, or alternatively prior to any approval taking effect, the applicant shall implement*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		the following steps unless these steps have already been undertaken for the project through a prior approval or action: *1) Using CalEEMod or another model accepted for this purpose by the City, calculate total expected GHG emissions (all sectors) for the proposed project under two scenarios: a) 1990 emissions rates; and, b) emission rates applicable at the time of the application, taking into account applicable building standards and other adopted regulatory requirements, as well as building design, use of renewable energy, etc.* *2) Calculate the difference between these two scenarios in step 1 as a percentage of the 1990 project emissions.* *3) Compare the difference in emissions from step 2 to the required minimum emissions reduction schedule provided below:*	

Applications Filed On or Before	***Minimum Required Reduction percentage in GHG Emissions from Calculated 1990 Emissions***
12/31/16	*22.5*
12/31/17	*25.0*
12/31/18	*27.5*
12/31/19	*30.0*

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation

12/31/20	*32.5*
12/31/21	*35.0*
12/31/22	*37.5*
12/31/23	*40.0*
12/31/24	*42.5*
12/31/25	*45.0*
12/31/26	*47.5*
12/31/27	*50.0*
12/31/28	*52.5*
12/31/29	*55.0*
12/31/30	*57.5 (2.5% increased reduction per year)*
12/31/35	*70.0 (2.5% increased reduction per year)*
12/31/40	*82.5 (2.5% increased reduction per year)*
12/31/45	*95.0 (2.5% increased reduction per year)*
12/31/50	*100.0*

If the difference calculated in Step 2 is greater than the required reduction in Step 3, the MRIC may "bank" this as a credit to use with later projects.

4) *If the difference calculated in step 2 does not demonstrate the required reduction in step 3, applicant shall identify feasible actions to achieve the required reductions using the following*

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		priority: • *First priority – building specific actions* • *Second priority – onsite (within MRIC) actions* • *Third priority – community based (within Davis) actions* • *Fourth priority – pay GHG reduction fees (carbon offsets) into a qualified existing local program, if one is in place* • *Fifth priority – other demonstrated method of reducing emissions* *5) Calculate, using acceptable methods, the measurable GHG reduction value of each proposed action.* *6) Provide a Technical Memorandum of Compliance (TMC) documenting the following minimum items: modeling (step 1); emissions calculations (step 2); applicable reduction (step 3); chosen feasible actions to achieve required reduction (step 4); and measurable GHG reduction value of each action (step 5). The TMC and all steps of the process are subject to review and authorization by the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability.* *7) Implement the authorized actions and provide evidence of this to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability. The*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		City upon review and acceptance of implementation, shall issue the subject entitlement, permit, or approval. *MRIC* *4.7-2(b)* *Every five years, the MRIC Master Owners' Association (MOA) shall submit a GHG Emissions Reduction Accounting and Program Effectiveness Report for the entire innovation center. The report shall be submitted by 12/31 of each fifth year starting in 2020. First report due by 12/31/20, second report due by 12/31/25, etc., through 2050 or until the center is built out.* *The report shall identify the following minimum items. Other documentation requirements may be added by the City if found to be necessary to satisfy this mitigation measure.* *1) Projected annual GHG emissions for MRIC, total and by sector, from the project EIR.* *2) GHG emissions from all uses collectively operating at the MRIC, total and by sector, at the time of reporting.* *3) GHG emissions from each occupied building within the MRIC, total and by sector.* *4) Summary of prior TMCs and 5-year reports.*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		5) Running total of MRIC emissions reductions and reduction credits, in total and by building. *6) Comprehensive data base and summary of implemented reduction actions.*	
4.7-3 Impacts related to energy associated with construction.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.7-4 Impacts related to energy associated with operations	PS	*MRIC* *4.7-4 Prior to approval of construction drawings for innovation center buildings that include data centers, the applicant shall submit an Energy Management Plan to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability demonstrating compliance with principles for energy management for data centers, which could include, but not be limited to the following:* • *IT Systems;* • *Air Management;* • *Centralized Air Handling;* • *Cooling Plant Optimization;* • *On-Site Generation;* • *Uninterruptible Power Supply Systems.* *Other energy efficient technologies and best practices that are available at the time construction drawings are submitted could be included in the Energy Management*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Plan as well, such as any measures described by US Department of Energy Center of Expertise for Energy Efficiency in Data Centers. *Mace Triangle – none*	
4.7-5 Conflict, or create an inconsistency, with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects related to GHG emissions and energy conservation.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
4.8-1 Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.8-2 Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment	PS	*MRIC* *4.8-2(a) Prior to any ground disturbance activities within 50 feet of a well on the project site, the applicant shall hire a licensed well contractor to obtain a well abandonment permit for any wells not anticipated to be used from the Yolo County Environmental Health Services*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
associated with the existing on-site wells, canals, nearby uses, or soil contamination.		*Department, and properly abandon the on-site wells, pursuant to review and approval by the City Engineer and the Yolo County Environmental Health Services Department.* *4.8-2(b)* *If any debris is encountered within the former canal on APN 033-630-009 during construction activities, as shown on the construction plans for the MRIC site, the contractor shall contact the project applicant, who shall retain the services of a qualified environmental hazard firm, to evaluate the debris to determine whether it poses any environmental contamination risks. A written evaluation shall be submitted to the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability. If the debris is trash or other non-hazardous material, then the contractor shall dispose of the debris and no further mitigation shall be required. If the debris is associated with signs of soil staining or odors indicative of hazardous materials, the environmental hazard firm shall conduct additional evaluation, including but not necessarily limited to soil sampling. If soil samples detect concentrations of hazardous materials above applicable Regional Screening Levels (RSL), then the soils shall be remediated and disposed of at a landfill licensed to accept hazardous waste. If constituent concentrations are below RSLs, then no further mitigation shall be necessary.*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Mace Triangle *4.8-2(c)* *In conjunction with submittal of a final planned development and/or tentative map for any parcel in the Mace Triangle, the applicant shall submit a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for that parcel, which shall evaluate on-site conditions, including but not limited to the presence of any wells, evidence of soil staining, or odors indicative of hazardous substances.* *In addition, due to the past agricultural operations on the easternmost parcel, a soil sampling program shall be implemented to assess potential agrichemical impacts to surface soil within the easternmost parcel, as follows:* *A soil sampling and analysis workplan shall be submitted for approval to Yolo County Environmental Health Department. The sampling and analysis plan will meet the requirements of the Department of Toxic Substances Control Interim Guidance for Sampling Agricultural Properties (2008).* *If the sampling results indicate the presence of agrichemicals that exceed commercial screening levels, a removal action workplan shall be prepared in coordination with Yolo County Environmental Health Department. The removal action workplan shall include*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		a detailed engineering plan for conducting the removal action, a description of the onsite contamination, the goals to be achieved by the removal action, and any alternative removal options that were considered and rejected and the basis for that rejection. A no further action letter will be issued by County Health for the proposed commercial development upon completion of the removal action. The removal action shall be deemed complete when the confirmation samples exhibit concentrations below the commercial screening levels, which will be established by the agencies. *If any stained soil or odor-impacted areas are encountered during the Phase I ESA, then soil sampling of these areas shall be included in the above soil sampling workplan, and depending upon the sampling results, included in the removal action workplan as well.*	
4.8-3 Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.8-4 Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving widland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	residences are intermixed with wildlands.			
4.8-5	**Conflict, or create an inconsistency, with applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects related to hazards and hazardous materials.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
	4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality			
4.9-1	**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.**	PS	*MRIC* *4.9-1(a)* *In conjunction with submittal of the first final planned development for the MRIC, a design-level drainage report shall be submitted to the City of Davis Public Works Department for review and approval. The drainage report shall identify specific storm drainage design features to control the 100-year, 24-day increased runoff from the project site to ensure that the rate of runoff leaving the developed MRIC site does not exceed the original Mace Ranch Channel design capacity of 260 cfs. This may be achieved through: on-site conveyance and detention facilities, off-site detention or retention facilities, channel modification, or equally effective measures to control the rate and*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		volume of runoff. *The design-level drainage report shall include off-site drainage facilities sufficient to detain and control the increased runoff volume when the flow from the Mace Drainage Channel into the Yolo Bypass is blocked by high water levels in the Bypass. Preliminary estimates of increased runoff volumes are as much as 63 acre-feet. The final amount of runoff volume to be detained would be determined with the design-level drainage report. This could result in detaining run-off volume for an extended time period. During this time period, additional large storms could occur; thus, the proposed detention storage facilities shall also be able to manage (detain with a controlled release) the 100-year, 24-hour storm event.* *The design-level drainage report shall also include design for detaining and controlling the increased run-off volume from the Mace Triangle site. Preliminary estimates of increased runoff volumes are as much as 7 acre-feet. The final amount of runoff volume to be detained would be determined with the design-level drainage report prepare for the MRIC.* *Design-level recommendations provided in the drainage report shall be included in the improvements plans prior to their approval by the Davis Public Works*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Department. *4.9-1(b)* *Prior to approval of the phase 1 improvement plans for the MRIC, the Public Works Department shall ensure that the plans include the development of the Phase 2 MDC improvements. The Phase 2 improvements shall consist of removal of the two 24-inch corrugated metal pipes in order to provide a continuous channel between the Phase 1 and Phase 2 improvements.* *Mace Triangle* *4.9-1(c)* *In conjunction with submittal of each final planned development for the Mace Triangle, a design-level drainage report for the development shall be completed and submitted to the City of Davis Public Works Department for review and approval. The drainage report shall identify specific storm drainage design features to control the 100-year, 24-hour increased runoff from the project site. This may be achieved through: onsite conveyance and detention facilities, offsite detention or retention facilities, channel modification, or equally effective measures to control the rate and volume of runoff.* *The design-level drainage report shall include off-site drainage facilities sufficient to detain and control the increased run-off volume when the flow from the Mace*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Drainage Channel into the Yolo Bypass is blocked by high water levels in the Bypass. Preliminary estimates of increased runoff volumes for the Mace Triangle site are as much as 7 acre-feet. The final amount of runoff volume to be detained for each proposed development would be determined with the design-level drainage report. This could result in detaining run-off volume for an extended time period. During this time period, additional large storms could occur; thus, the proposed detention storage facilities shall also be able to manage (detain with a controlled release) the 100-year, 24-hour storm event. *Design-level recommendations provided in the drainage report shall be included in the improvement plans prior to their approval by the Davis Public Works Department.*	
4.9-2 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.	PS	*MRIC and Mace Triangle* *4.9-2 Prior to initiation of any ground disturbing activities, the project applicant(s) for each discretionary development application shall prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that comply with the General Construction Stormwater Permit from the Central Valley RWQCB, to reduce water quality effects during construction. Such BMPs may include: temporary erosion control measures such as silt fences,*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		staked straw bales/wattles, silt/sediment basins and traps, check dams, geofabric, sandbag dikes, and temporary revegetation. The SWPPP shall be kept on-site and implemented during construction activities and shall be made available upon request to representatives of the City of Davis and/or RWQCB.	
4.9-3 Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff, or otherwise substantially degrade water quality during operations.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.9-4 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 or preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted).	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact		Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.9-5	**Place structure within a 100-year flood hazard as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or flood hazard delineation map; or place within a 100-year floodplain structures which would impede or redirect flood flows; or expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.9-6	**Impacts related to conflicts, or creation of an inconsistency, with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects related to hydrology and water quality.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.10 Land Use and Urban Decay			
4.10-1 Physical division of an established community.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.10-2 Economic and social changes and/or effects that result in urban decay.	PS	*MRIC* *4.10-2 Prior to building permit issuance for ancillary retail space, the applicant shall demonstrate to the City's satisfaction that there is sufficient unmet demand from a combination of retail demand from MRIC employees and businesses and/or retail demand from elsewhere within the Davis marketplace to support the retail space for which the building permit is requested. The objective of this requirement is to ensure that retail space developed within the MRIC will not re-allocate demand from existing Davis retailers, but will instead help the City to increase its net retail capture rate and provide new retail offerings that will satisfy currently unmet demand.* *Mace Triangle – none*	LS
4.10-3 Conflict, or create an inconsistency, with any applicable land use and urban decay plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
effect.			
4.11 Noise and Vibration			
4.11-1 A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without project.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.11-2 Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.11-3 Transportation noise impacts to existing sensitive receptors in the project vicinity.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.11-4 Transportation noise impacts to new sensitive receptors in the project vicinity.	PS	*MRIC – none* *Mace Triangle* *4.11-4 In conjunction with the submittal of a final planned development and/or tentative map for the Mace Triangle, the applicant shall submit an acoustical analysis to the Department of Community Development and Sustainability. The acoustical analysis shall measure existing noise levels in the vicinity of the Mace Triangle site, as well as model the predicted noise levels for the scenarios determined to be appropriate by the*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		certified noise consultant and the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability. The existing and predicted future exterior and interior noise levels shall account for any noise sources in the area, potentially including roadway, railway, and nearby outdoor uses. The acoustical analysis shall identify and classify the proposed uses in order to determine the appropriate noise level standards. If any uses identified in Table 19 of the General Plan Noise Chapter are proposed on-site, the acoustical analysis shall evaluate whether predicted transportation noise levels (traffic and train) would exceed the City of Davis' exterior and interior noise level criteria at such use areas. If the City's noise level criteria would be exceeded, the acoustical analysis shall include a detailed list of any noise attenuation measures needed for the proposed uses to comply with the City's exterior and interior noise level standards, for review and approval by the Department of Community Development and Sustainability.	
4.11-5 Operational noise.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.11-6 Conflict, or create an inconsistency, with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects related to noise.	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.12 Population and Housing			
4.12-1 Induce substantial population growth.	S	*None feasible.*	SU
4.12-2 Conflict, or create an inconsistency, with any applicable population and housing plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.13 Public Services and Recreation			
4.13-1 Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions 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	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	facilities.			
4.13-2	**Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions of new or physically altered police protection facilities, and/or the need for new 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.**	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.13-3	**Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions 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 service ratios, response times,**	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	or other performance objectives for school facilities.			
4.13-4	**Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions 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 acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for park facilities.**	PS	*MRIC* *4.13-4 In conjunction with submittal of the first Final Planned Development Guidelines, or Tentative Map, whichever occurs first, the applicant for the MRIC shall submit a design level Greenspace Exhibit illustrating how the proposed project would meet the following requirements:* • ***Parklands:*** *29.4 acres* • ***Greenways/open space:*** *21.2 acres* • ***Agricultural buffer:*** *20.1 acres (one-third of that total, or 6.7 acres, can be applied to the greenways/open space total above)* *The parkland and greenspace shall be open to/available for public use in the same manner and standards as other City parks and greenspace (whether privately or publicly owned). The Greenspace exhibit shall be reviewed by the Department of Community Development and Sustainability and the Parks and Community Services Department. The final Greenspace Exhibit shall be incorporated into the Final Planned Development Guidelines.* *Mace Triangle – none.*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.13-5 Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions of new and/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 order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for other public facilities.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.13-6 Conflict, or create an inconsistency, with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects related to public services and recreation.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.14 Transportation and Circulation			
4.14-1 Impacts to Intersections Outside Freeway Interchange Areas.	PS	*MRIC and Mace Triangle* *4.14-1 As directed by the City, based on either a focused*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		development phase traffic study as described in Mitigation Measure 4.14-2, or the monitoring carried out by the Master Owners' Association (MOA) as part of the Project Travel Demand Management Program described in Mitigation Measure 4.14-6, the project applicant shall fund, and the City shall supervise, the design and construction of a traffic signal at the intersection of Monarch Lane/Covell Boulevard. The signal design, timing plans, and coordination plan for adjacent Covell Boulevard signals shall be reviewed and approved by the Davis Public Works Department prior to issuance of a building permit for the traffic signal. Funding for the signal will be deposited at the time of the first final map. Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle on a fair share basis. Based on analysis already performed, this improvement is not triggered by phase one MRIC development; however, all MRIC development shall have a fair share funding obligation.	
4.14-2 Impacts to Intersections within the Mace Boulevard Interchange Area.	S	*MRIC* *4.14-2(a)* *In conjunction with submittal of a final planned development, or tentative map, whichever occurs first, for Phase 2 of development, as well as all subsequent phases, the Master Owners' Association (MOA) for the Project shall submit a focused traffic impact study to determine if any of the intersection, roadway,*	SU

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		interchange, external roadway, or freeway mitigations are required based on the additional traffic generated by the development phase. The focused traffic study shall address the impact of adding the individual phase of development to existing plus other approved/pending development projects. The traffic study shall use the current version of the SACOG travel demand forecasting model available at the time of the study, and the traffic operations analysis methods utilized in this EIR. If operations are found to have declined to unacceptable levels based on the relevant criteria under Standard of Significance #1, above, the project applicant shall construct physical improvements or pay its fair share as described prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy for the first building in that phase. *Mace Triangle – none* *<u>Mitigation Options for Mace Boulevard/I-80 Westbound Ramps; Mace Boulevard/2nd Street/County Road 32A; and Mace Boulevard/Alhambra Drive</u>* *Three potential mitigation options are available for the mitigation of the impact to the three interchange area intersections. Each measure is described below, followed by an evaluation of its effectiveness:*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		1. ***Option 1 (Roadway and Intersection Widening Alternative):*** *Widen the roadways and intersections in the impacted area to provide LOS E or better operation;* 2. ***Option 2 (Widening Plus Project Access Change Alternative):*** *Modify the proposed new project access on Mace Boulevard, north of Alhambra Drive, to provide a traffic signal with full access (i.e., all movements allowed), as well as widen adjacent roadways and intersections to provide LOS E or better operation as needed, lessening the turning movement demand at the Project access driveway at the Alhambra Drive intersection; or* 3. ***Option 3 (Interchange Alternative):*** *Construct capacity improvements at the County Road 32A/32B interchange and on County Road 32A to accommodate more Project traffic to use this interchange, lessening the traffic on the Mace Boulevard interchange.* *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *4.14-2(b)* ***Roadway and Intersection Widening Alternative (Option 1):*** *Construct improvements to Mace Boulevard to provide sufficient capacity to serve the Existing Plus Project traffic. Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle on a fair share basis (see Appendix J for a detailed sketch of the improvements):*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		• *Southbound Mace Boulevard: Add a third southbound lane from the westbound ramps intersection to the eastbound loop on-ramp, with two lanes feeding the on-ramp* • *Northbound Mace Boulevard: Extend the third northbound lane from the westbound ramps to the 2nd Street intersection* • *Westbound Ramps intersection: eliminate the westbound free right lane and build two right turn lanes* • *Mace Boulevard/2nd Street/County Road 32A intersection: Widen approaches to add a new westbound left turn lane, and lengthen the westbound left turn lanes to 400 feet in length. Remove the eastbound free right turn channelizing island and replace with a non-channelized right turn lane.* • *Mace Boulevard/Alhambra Drive/Central Project Driveway intersection: Widen the Project access driveway to provide three outbound lanes with two westbound left-turn lanes and one westbound through/right lane. Add a southbound left turn lane 400 feet in length. Provide a northbound through-*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		right lane and an exclusive northbound right turn lane. *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *4.14-2(c)* ***Widening Plus Project Access Change Alternative (Option 2):*** *Modify the proposed new project access on Mace Boulevard, north of Alhambra Drive, to provide a traffic signal with full access (i.e., all movements allowed), and widen adjacent roadways and intersections to provide LOS E or better operation, as described in Option 4.14-2(b). Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle on a fair share basis.* *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *4.14-2(d)* ***Interchange Alternative (Option 3):*** *Construct capacity improvements at the County Road 32 interchange and along County Road 32A to allow this interchange to serve more project traffic and reduce project traffic using the Mace Boulevard interchange. Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle on a fair share basis. The improvements include:*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		• *Reconstruction, widening, and potential relocation to the west, of the eastbound and westbound on- and off-ramps to provide more storage capacity, and to provide traffic signals or roundabouts at the ramp terminal intersections. Provision of an auxiliary lane between the relocated eastbound on-ramp merge and the causeway structure.* • *Provision of a grade separation of County Road 32A and the UPRR tracks, a near-term improvement prior to provision of the grade separation would consist of relocating the CR 32A/CR 105 intersection about 200 feet to the north and installing double gates on the south approach to the grade crossing in order to improve safety and traffic functionality at the grade crossing.* • *Re-configuration of the County Road 32A/County Road 105 intersection to provide uninterrupted County Road 32A flow with County Road 105 under stop control.*	
4.14-3 Impacts to Regional Roadways.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.14-4 Impacts to Freeways.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.14-5 Impacts to Local Neighborhood Street Traffic.	S	*MRIC* *4.14-5 Prior to final map approval, the project applicant shall fund the development of a neighborhood traffic calming plan, the City shall adopt the plan, and the applicant*	SU

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		shall fund implementation of the plan. The traffic calming plan will address Alhambra Drive, Loyola Drive, Fifth Street, and Monarch Lane. Existing weekday daily traffic counts and 85th percentile speeds shall be collected on the above neighborhood streets as part of the traffic calming plan development process. The purpose of the plan will be to maintain both the volume and speed of vehicle traffic on these streets, through the use measures proven in other neighborhoods and jurisdictions to achieve these goals, such as narrow points, neighborhood traffic circles, speed humps, stop signs (where warranted), narrow lane striping, and others. Implementation of a comprehensive traffic calming plan will incentivize traffic to use major routes such as I-80, East Covell Boulevard, Mace Boulevard, and 2nd Street, and avoiding using residential streets as cut-through routes. *Mace Triangle – none*	
4.14-6 Increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled.	PS	*MRIC* *4.14-6(a) Prior to issuance of the first building permit in the first phase of development, the applicant shall develop a TDM program for the entire proposed project, including any anticipated phasing, and shall submit the TDM program to the City Department of Public Works for review and approval. The TDM program must be designed to achieve the following:*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		1. Reduce trips to achieve one and five-tenths (1.5) Average Vehicle Ridership (AVR) in accordance with Davis Municipal Code Section 22.15.060; and *2. Reduce daily and peak hour vehicle trips, as forecast for the project in this transportation impact assessment, by 10 percent for every project phase.* *The Master Owners' Association (MOA) shall be responsible for implementing the TDM Program.* *(a) The MOA shall be responsible for funding and overseeing the delivery of trip reduction/TDM proposed programs and strategies to achieve the AVR objectives, which may include, but are not limited to, the following:* *(1) Establishment of carpool, buspool, or vanpool programs;* *(2) Vanpool purchase incentives;* *(3) Cash allowances, passes or other public transit subsidies and purchase incentives;* *(4) Low emission vehicle purchase incentives/subsidies;* *(5) Parking fees set at levels sufficient to incentivize alternative modes;* *(6) Full or partial parking subsidies for ridesharing vehicles;* *(7) Preferential parking locations for ridesharing*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		vehicles; *(8) Computerized commuter rideshare matching service;* *(9) Guaranteed ride-home program for ridesharing;* *(10) Alternative workweek and flex-time schedules;* *(11) Telecommuting or work-at-home programs;* *(12) On-site lunch rooms/cafeterias;* *(13) On-site commercial services such as banks, restaurants and small retail;* *(14) On-site day care facilities;* *(15) Bicycle programs including bike purchase incentives, storage, maintenance programs, and on-site education program;* *(16) On-site car share and bike share service;* *(17) Enhancements to Unitrans or Yolobus bus service;* *(18) Enhancements to Capitol Corridor or future Regional Rail service;* *(19) Enhancements to the citywide bicycle network;* *(20) Dedicated employee housing located either on-site or elsewhere in the City of Davis;* *(21) Designation of an on-site transportation coordinator for the project.* *(b) Single-phase development projects shall achieve TDM AVR objectives within five (5) years of issuance of any certificate of occupancy. Multi-*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		phased projects shall achieve the objectives for each phase within three (3) years of the issuance of any certificate of occupancy. *(c) In conjunction with final map approval, recorded codes, covenants and restrictions (CC&Rs) shall include provisions to guarantee adherence to the TDM objectives and perpetual operation of the TDM program regardless of property ownership, inform all subsequent property owners of the requirements imposed herein, and identify potential consequences of nonperformance.* *Each space use agreement (i.e., lease document) shall also include TDM provisions for the site as a means to inform and commit tenants to, and participate in, helping specific applicable developments meet TDM performance requirements.* *(d) The MOA shall allow Mace Triangle businesses to participate within the MRIC TDM.* *(e) Ongoing reporting:* *(1) **Annual TDM Report.** The MOA for the Project shall submit an annual status report on the TDM program to the City Department of Public Works beginning a year after the issuance of any certificate of occupancy and*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		continuing until full project buildout. Data shall be collected in October of each year and the Annual Report submitted by December 31st of each year. The report shall be prepared in the form and format designated by the City, which must either approve or disapprove the program within sixty (60) days. *i. The TDM performance reports shall focus on the trip reduction incentives offered by the project, their effectiveness, the estimated greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions generated by the project, and the methods by which a continued trajectory towards carbon neutrality in 2050 can be achieved consistent with Mitigation Measure 4.7-2. The report shall:* • *Report the AVR levels attained;* • *Verify the TDM plan incentives that have been offered;* • *Describe the use of those incentives offered by employers;* • *Evaluate why the plan did or did not work to achieve the AVR targets and explain why the revised plan is more*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		likely to achieve the AVR target levels; • *List additional incentives which can be reasonably expected to correct deficiencies;* • *Evaluate the feasibility and effectiveness of trip reduction/TDM program and strategies, as implemented;* • *Estimate the greenhouse gas emissions generated by Project transportation operations; and* • *Identify off-setting GHG credits to be secured by the Project to achieve carbon neutrality.* *ii. The MOA shall conduct employee travel surveys annually to determine TDM program participation, AVR levels, and estimated mode shares, and monitor weekday AM and PM peak hour traffic operations every three years at all impact locations identified in this EIR, comparing the operating LOS with the relevant standards in this EIR. The survey instrument and LOS monitoring plan will be reviewed and approved by the City prior to implementation.*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		iii. The MOA shall also develop and implement a program to monitor daily and peak hour traffic volumes entering and exiting the site, to be conducted annually. The monitoring shall demonstrate that the external vehicle trip generation remains below the EIR projection of 2,453 AM peak hour trips and 2,262 PM peak hour trips. The monitoring program may include statistical considerations to ensure that non-statistically significant increases do not constitute violation of the trip ceiling. *iv. If the trip ceiling is exceeded for any two consecutive years, the applicant or current owner of the site will contribute funding to be determined in a separate study toward the provision of additional or more intensive travel demand management programs, such as enhanced regional transit service to the site, employee shuttles, and other potential measures.* *v. In the event that other TDM objectives are not met as documented in the Annual Monitoring Report submitted by December 31st of each year, the MOA shall:*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		• *Submit to the City within thirty (30) days of submittal of the annual report, a list of TDM measures that will be implemented to meet the TDM objectives within one hundred eighty (180) days of submittal of annual report. At the end of the one-hundred-eighty-day period, the MOA shall submit a revised performance report to determine compliance with TDM objectives. No further measures will be necessary if the TDM objectives are met.* *Should the TDM objectives not be satisfied by the end of the one-hundred-eighty-day period, the MOA shall pay a TDM penalty fee to the City in an amount determined by resolution of the City Council. Said penalty fee may be used to provide new transit service and/or subsidize existing transit service, construct bicycle facilities, and/or improve street capacity through construction of physical improvements to be selected by the City of Davis from the list of area-wide improvements identified in the City's CIP.* *Mace Triangle* *4.14-6(b) Prior to issuance of a building permit for development*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		within the Mace Triangle site, each applicant shall develop a TDM program coordinated with, and compliant with, the requirements of the MRIC TDM program and any pre-existing TDM programs on the Mace Triangle site. The program shall be submitted to the City Department of Public Works for review and approval. This includes achievement of the same trip reduction requirements, GHG-reducing transportation strategies, and monitoring and reporting requirements as the MRIC. This may be satisfied by joining the MRIC TDM program as a participating member.	
4.14-7 Impacts to Emergency Vehicle Access.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.14-8 Impacts associated with Construction Vehicle Traffic.	PS	*MRIC and Mace Triangle* *4.14-8 Prior to any construction activities for the proposed project, the 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 prior to 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:*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		• *The number of truck trips, time, and day of street closures* • *Time of day of arrival and departure of trucks* • *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* • *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.*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.14-9 Impacts to Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities.	PS	*MRIC and Mace Triangle* *4.14-9(a) The project applicant shall fund and construct the following bicycle and pedestrian improvements.* • *Prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy in Phase 1 of the MRIC, the applicant shall construct the multi-use path on west side of Mace Boulevard from just north of Alhambra Drive to existing path along frontage of Harper Junior High School, as shown on the Project site plan.* • *Prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy in Phase 1 of the MRIC, the applicant shall construct a crossing for westbound cyclists on County Road 32A, southeast of the existing at-grade railroad crossing at County Road 32A and County Road 105. The crossing shall be a marked crossing, with advanced warning devices for vehicle traffic, for westbound cyclists on CR 32A that are continuing west onto the off-street path located between the Union Pacific Railroad and I-80 (e.g., to the west of County Road 105). As noted earlier, Union Pacific has discussed the potential closure of the at-grade rail crossing. If that occurs, this mitigation measure will not be required.* • *Prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy in Phase 1 of the MRIC, the access road*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		from the Park-and-Ride Lot to County Road 32A shall be improved with sidewalks, per the project description. • *Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle on a fair share basis.* *4.14-9(b)* *Prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy in Phase 1 of the MRIC, the project applicant shall fund a study for a bicycle/pedestrian grade-separated crossing of Mace Boulevard to supplement the City of Davis' Bicycle Action Plan/Bike Plan.* • *The study shall evaluate the preferred location, design, funding, and construction timing of the crossing. Identification of a preferred location shall take into consideration several factors, including but not limited to, connectivity to other existing and planned bicycle facilities, environmental constraints, and construction costs.* • *At or prior to commencement of construction of any building in Phase 2, the project applicant shall: 1) submit design-level drawings of the grade-separated crossing to the City for review and approval; and 2) provide the project's fair share funding to the City for this improvement (or alternatively construct the improvement) subject to agreement with the City.*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		• *Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle on a fair share basis.*	
4.14-10 Impacts to Transit Services.	PS	*MRIC and Mace Triangle* *4.14-10 Prior to the issuance of the first certificate of occupancy of the first MRIC project phase, the project applicant shall fund and construct new bus stops with turnouts on both sides of Mace Boulevard at the new primary project access point at Alhambra Drive. The project applicant shall prepare design plans, to be reviewed and approved by the City Public Works Department, and construct bus stops with shelters, paved pedestrian waiting areas, lighting, real time transit information signage, and pedestrian connections between the new bus stops and all buildings on the project site. Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle on a fair share basis.*	LS
4.14-11 Conflict, or create an inconsistency, with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects related to transportation/traffic.	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.15 Utilities			
4.15-1 Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.15-2 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
4.15-3 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.	PS	*MRIC* *4.15-3(a) The applicant shall provide for annual wet-weather monitoring of the existing off-site 42-inch or 21-inch sanitary sewer line, depending upon which off-site sewer alignment is chosen for the project, over the course of project buildout to confirm that there is capacity within the line to serve the MRIC, in combination with existing and future projected General Plan buildout. If the wet weather monitoring fails to confirm capacity within the chosen existing sanitary sewer line, the applicant shall either upsize the existing sewer line, subject to reimbursement, or install a parallel line, subject to review and approval by the City Engineer.*	LS

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		4.15-3(b) *If the applicant pursues a connection to the existing 8-inch sewer line in Mace Boulevard to serve Phase 1 of the MRIC, then prior to approval of Improvement Plans for Phase 1, the applicant shall prepare and submit to the Davis Public Works Department, a sewer study, which shall determine the available capacity in the 8-inch sewer pipe in Mace Boulevard. If the 8-inch line has adequate capacity for Phase 1 of the MRIC Project, then no further mitigation is needed. If the sewer study determines that the 8-inch line does not have adequate capacity to serve Phase 1, then the applicant shall upsize the sewer pipe within Mace Boulevard, or pursue construction of the northerly or easterly off-site sewer pipe connection alternative. The design of the sewer pipe improvements shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer prior to approval of Phase 1 Improvement Plans.* *Mace Triangle – none*	
4.15-4 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 and regulations related to solid waste.	LS	*None required.*	N/A

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
4.15-5 Gas and electric facilities.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
4.15-6 Adequate telecommunications facilities.	PS	*MRIC* *4.15-5 Prior to approval of construction drawings for each phase of the project, the drawings shall include "dark" fiber routes within the MRIC site and connection points to the existing intercity fiber routes, subject to review and approval by the City Engineer.* *Mace Triangle – none*	LS
4.15-7 Conflict, or create an inconsistency, with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigation environmental effects related to utilities.	LS	*None required.*	N/A
5 Cumulative (MRIC and Mace Triangle)			
5-1 Cumulative impacts related to long-term changes in visual character of the region.	CEQA CC	CEQA *None available.*	CEQA SU
	Modified CC	Modified *None available.*	Modified SU
5-2 Cumulative impacts related to the creation of new sources of light or glare associated with development of the proposed	CEQA PCC	CEQA *MRIC and Mace Triangle*	CEQA LCC

CC = *Cumulatively Considerable;* LS = *Less-than-Significant;* LCC = *Less-than-Cumulatively-Considerable;* PS = *Potentially Significant;* PCC = *Potentially Cumulatively Considerable;* N/A = *Not Applicable;* S = *Significant;* SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	project in combination with future buildout in the City of Davis.		*5-2 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.1-3.*	
		Modified PCC	Modified *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-2 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.1-3.*	Modified LCC
5-3	**Impacts related to cumulative loss of agricultural land.**	CEQA CC	CEQA *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-3 Implement Mitigation Measures 4.2-1(a) and (b) and 4.2-3(b).*	CEQA SU
		Modified CC	Modified *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-3 Implement Mitigation Measures 4.2-1(a) and (b).*	Modified SU
5-4	**A cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.**	CEQA CC	CEQA *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-4 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-2.*	CEQA SU
		Modified CC	Modified *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-4 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.3-2.*	Modified SU

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
5-5	**Cumulative loss of habitat in the City of Davis area for special-status species.**	CEQA CC	CEQA *MRIC* *5-5(a) Implement Mitigation Measures 4.4-2, 4.4-3, 4.4-6, 4.4-7, and 4.4-12.* *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-5(b) Implement Mitigation Measures 4.4-1, 4.4-4, 4.4-5, and 4.4-11.*	CEQA SU
		Modified CC	Modified *MRIC* *5-5(a) Implement Mitigation Measures 4.4-2, 4.4-3, 4.4-6, 4.4-7, and 4.4-12.* *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-5(b) Implement Mitigation Measures 4.4-1, 4.4-4, 4.4-5, and 4.4-11.*	Modified SU
5-6	**Cumulative impacts to movement corridors in the City of Davis area.**	CEQA LCC	CEQA *None required.*	CEQA N/A
		Modified LCC	Modified *None required.*	Modified N/A

CC = *Cumulatively Considerable;* LS = *Less-than-Significant;* LCC = *Less-than-Cumulatively-Considerable;* PS = *Potentially Significant;* PCC = *Potentially Cumulatively Considerable;* N/A = *Not Applicable;* S = *Significant;* SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
5-7	**Cumulative loss of cultural resources.**	CEQA PCC	CEQA *MRIC* *5-7(a) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.5-1.* *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-7(b) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.5-2.*	CEQA LCC
		Modified PCC	Modified *MRIC* *5-7(a) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.5-1.* *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-7(b) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.5-2.*	Modified LCC
5-8	**Cumulative increase in the potential for geological related impacts and hazards.**	CEQA LCC	CEQA *None required.*	CEQA N/A
		Modified LCC	Modified *None required.*	Modified N/A
5-9	**Cumulative impacts related to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and global climate change.**	CEQA CC	CEQA *MRIC* *5-9(a) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2(b).*	CEQA SU

CC = *Cumulatively Considerable;* LS = *Less-than-Significant*; LCC = *Less-than-Cumulatively-Considerable;* PS = *Potentially Significant*; PCC = *Potentially Cumulatively Considerable;* N/A = *Not Applicable*; S = *Significant*; SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		MRIC and Mace Triangle *5-9(b) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2(a).*	
	Modified CC	Modified *MRIC* *5-9(a) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2(b).* *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-9(b) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.7-2(a).*	Modified SU
5-10 Cumulative impacts related to energy.	CEQA LCC	CEQA *None required.*	CEQA N/A
	Modified LCC	Modified *None required.*	Modified N/A
5-11 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 buildout in the City of Davis.	CEQA LCC	CEQA *None required.*	CEQA N/A
	Modified LCC	Modified *None required.*	Modified N/A

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

	Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
5-12	**Cumulative impacts associated with increases in volume runoff and effects to on- and off-site flooding within the City of Davis planning area.**	CEQA PCC	CEQA *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-12 Implement Mitigation Measures 4.9-1(a) through 4.9-1(c).*	CEQA LCC
		Modified PCC	Modified *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-12 Implement Mitigation Measures 4.9-1(a) through 4.9-1(c).*	Modified LCC
5-13	**Cumulative impacts to water quality within the City of Davis.**	CEQA LCC	CEQA *None required.*	CEQA N/A
		Modified LCC	Modified *None required.*	Modified N/A
5-14	**Cumulative land use incompatibilities.**	CEQA LCC	CEQA *None required.*	CEQA N/A
		Modified LCC	Modified *None required.*	Modified N/A
5-15	**Cumulative urban decay.**	CEQA PCC	CEQA *MRIC* *5-15 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-3.* *Mace Triangle – none*	CEQA LCC

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	Modified PCC	Modified *MRIC* *5-15 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.10-3.* *Mace Triangle – none*	Modified LCC
5-16 Cumulative impacts on noise-sensitive receptors.	CEQA LCC	CEQA *None required.*	CEQA N/A
	Modified LCC	Modified *None required.*	Modified N/A
5-17 Cumulative traffic noise effects on proposed uses.	CEQA PCC	CEQA *MRIC – none* *Mace Triangle* *5-17 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.11-4.*	CEQA LCC
	Modified PCC	Modified *MRIC – none* *MRIC Triangle* *5-17 Implement Mitigation Measure 4.11-4.*	Modified LCC
5-18 Cumulative population and housing impacts.	CEQA CC	CEQA *None feasible.*	CEQA SU

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
	Modified CC	Modified *None feasible.*	Modified SU
5-19 Cumulative impacts to fire protection services from the proposed project in combination with future developments in the City of Davis.	CEQA CC	CEQA *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-19 Prior to issuance of building permits for each phase of development, the project applicant shall contribute the project's fair share funding towards one of the following mitigation options, as determined by the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability and Davis Fire Department:* *1. Construct a fourth fire station within the City of Davis.* *2. Modify of existing Davis fire facilities, which may include renovation of existing fire stations.* *3. Complete a Fire Facilities Master Plan (FFMP), and Community Risk and Standards of Cover Study to identify the various alternatives that could be implemented to enable the City of Davis Fire Department to reach all areas of the City, including the Davis Mace Ranch Innovation Center project site, within a five-minute emergency response time, 90 percent of the time, consistent with Davis General Plan Policy POLFIRE 1.2.*	CEQA SU

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Once the mitigation option is selected, the identified improvement project(s) shall be included in the City's Capital Improvement Program and the City's Fire Impact Fee updated accordingly. In addition, each improvement project shall be subject to its own environmental review process, unless the improvement can be determined by the City to be exempt from CEQA.	
	Modified CC	Modified *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-19 Prior to issuance of building permits for each phase of development, the project applicant shall contribute the project's fair share funding towards one of the following mitigation options, as determined by the City of Davis Department of Community Development and Sustainability and Davis Fire Department:* *1. Construct a fourth fire station within the City of Davis.* *2. Modify of existing Davis fire facilities, which may include renovation of existing fire stations.* *3. Complete a Fire Facilities Master Plan (FFMP), and Community Risk and Standards of Cover Study to identify the various alternatives that could be implemented to enable the City of Davis Fire Department to reach all areas of the City, including the Davis Mace Ranch Innovation Center project*	Modified SU

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		site, within a five-minute emergency response time, 90 percent of the time, consistent with Davis General Plan Policy POLFIRE 1.2. *Once the mitigation option is selected, the identified improvement project(s) shall be included in the City's Capital Improvement Program and the City's Fire Impact Fee updated accordingly. In addition, each improvement project shall be subject to its own environmental review process, unless the improvement can be determined by the City to be exempt from CEQA.*	
5-20 Cumulative impacts to public services and recreation from the proposed project in combination with future developments in the City of Davis.	CEQA LCC	CEQA *None required.*	CEQA N/A
	Modified LCC	Modified *None required.*	Modified N/A
5-21 Cumulative Impacts to Intersections Within the Freeway Interchange Area.	CEQA CC	CEQA *Focused Traffic Study Requirement to Verify Timing for Improvements* *MRIC* *5-21(a) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.14-2(a)* *Mace Triangle – none*	CEQA SU

CC = *Cumulatively Considerable;* LS = *Less-than-Significant;* LCC = *Less-than-Cumulatively-Considerable;* PS = *Potentially Significant;* PCC = *Potentially Cumulatively Considerable;* N/A = *Not Applicable;* S = *Significant;* SU = *Significant and Unavoidable*

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Mitigation Options for Mace Boulevard/I-80 Westbound Ramps and Mace Boulevard/2nd Street/County Road 32A *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-21(b)* ***Roadway and Intersection Widening Alternative (Option 1)*** *Construct the improvements to Mace Boulevard to provide sufficient capacity to serve the Cumulative Plus Project traffic Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle on a fair share basis:* *In addition to the widenings identified in Mitigation Measure 4.14-2(b), the following improvements shall be implemented:* • *Southbound Mace Boulevard: Extend the third southbound lane back from the Westbound Ramps to the 2nd Street/County Road 32A intersection;* • *Northbound Mace Boulevard: Add a third northbound lane between 2nd Street/County Road 32A and Alhambra Avenue/Project Central Driveway, and extend a second northbound through lane from Alhambra Drive to the project northern driveway;*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		• *2nd Street/County Road 32A intersection: Widen eastbound approach to add a second left turn lane;* • *I-80 Westbound Ramps intersection: lengthen westbound right-turn lane* *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-21(c)* ***Widening Plus Project Access Change Alternative (Option 2):*** *Modify the proposed new project access on Mace Boulevard, north of Alhambra Drive, to provide a traffic signal with full access (i.e., all movements allowed), and widen adjacent roadways and intersections to provide LOS E or better operation as described in Option 5-21(b). Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle on a fair share basis.* *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-21(d)* ***Interchange Alternative (Option 3)****:* *Construct capacity improvements at the County Road 32 interchange and along County Road 32A to allow this interchange to serve more project traffic and reduce project traffic using the Mace Boulevard interchange.*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle on a fair share basis The improvements include: • *Reconstruction, widening, and potential relocation to the west, of the eastbound and westbound on- and off-ramps to provide more storage capacity, and to provide traffic signals or roundabouts at the ramp terminal intersections. Provision of an auxiliary lane between the relocated eastbound on-ramp merge and the causeway structure.* • *Provision of a grade separation of County Road 32A and the UPRR tracks;* • *Re-configuration of the County Road 32A/County Road 105 intersection to provide uninterrupted County Road 32A flow with County Road 105 under stop control.*	
	Modified CC	Modified *Focused Traffic Study Requirement to Verify Timing for Improvements* *MRIC* *5-21(a) Implement Mitigation Measure 4.14-2(a)*	Modified SU

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Mace Triangle – none *Mitigation Options for Mace Boulevard/I-80 Westbound Ramps; Mace Boulevard/2nd Street/County Road 32A; and Chiles Road/I-80 Eastbound Off-Ramp* *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-21(b)* ***Roadway and Intersection Widening Alternative (Option 1)*** *Construct the improvements to Mace Boulevard to provide sufficient capacity to serve the Cumulative Plus Project traffic. Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle on a fair share basis.* *In addition to the widenings identified in Mitigation Measure 4.14-2(b), the following improvements shall be implemented:* • *Southbound Mace Boulevard: Extend the third southbound lane back from the Westbound Ramps to the 2nd Street/County Road 32A intersection;* • *Northbound Mace Boulevard: Add a second northbound lane between 2nd Street/County Road 32A and Alhambra Avenue/Project Central Driveway;*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		• *Mace Boulevard/Alhambra Drive: Add a second southbound left-turn lane;* • *Second Street/County Road 32A intersection: no additions;* • *I-80 eastbound straight on-ramp: no additions.* *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-21(c)* ***Widening Plus Project Access Change Alternative (Option 2):*** *Modify the proposed new project access on Mace Boulevard, north of Alhambra Drive, to provide a traffic signal with full access (i.e., all movements allowed), and widen adjacent roadways and intersections to provide LOS E or better operation as described in Mitigation Measure 5-21(b). Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle on a fair share basis.* *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-21(d)* ***Interchange Alternative (Option 3)****:*	

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		Construct capacity improvements at the County Road 32 interchange and along County Road 32A to allow this interchange to serve more project traffic and reduce project traffic using the Mace Boulevard interchange. Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle on a fair share basis. The improvements include: • *Reconstruction, widening, and potential relocation to the west, of the eastbound and westbound on- and off-ramps to provide more storage capacity, and to provide traffic signals or roundabouts at the ramp terminal intersections. Provision of an auxiliary lane between the relocated eastbound on-ramp merge and the causeway structure.* • *Provision of a grade separation of County Road 32A and the UPRR tracks;* • *Re-configuration of the County Road 32A/County Road 105 intersection to provide uninterrupted County Road 32A flow with County Road 105 under stop control.*	
5-22 Cumulative Impacts to Roadway Segments.	CEQA CC	CEQA *MRIC and Mace Triangle*	CEQA SU

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		5-22 *The MRIC Master Owners' Association shall coordinate with the City of Davis to implement travel route management strategies, including changeable message signs with route delay information and downtown parking capacity information, signal coordination and timing plans, and other roadway network management strategies, as appropriate, to efficiently manage the capacities of the various major roadways (i.e., Richards Boulevard, Cowell Boulevard, Pole Line Road, Fifth Street, Old Davis Road, etc.) serving as the primary travel corridors in Davis. Annual monitoring shall be conducted by the Master Owners' Association, and submitted to the City, to verify effectiveness of the route management strategies. Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle on a fair share basis.*	
	Modified CC	Modified *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-22(a)* *The MRIC Master Owners' Association shall coordinate with the City of Davis to implement travel route management strategies, including changeable message signs with route delay information and downtown parking capacity information, signal coordination and timing plans, and other roadway network management strategies, as appropriate, to efficiently manage the*	Modified SU

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		capacities of the various major roadways (i.e., Richards Boulevard, Cowell Boulevard, Pole Line Road, Fifth Street, Old Davis Road, etc.) serving as the primary travel corridors in Davis. Annual monitoring shall be conducted by the Master Owners' Association, and submitted to the City, to verify effectiveness of the route management strategies. Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle on a fair share basis. *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-22(b) Project applicant shall widen Covell Boulevard from two lanes to four lanes from the Harper Junior High School access to Alhambra Boulevard. Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle on a fair share basis.*	
5-23 Cumulative Impacts to Local Area Freeway Segments.	CEQA CC	CEQA *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-23 The applicant shall contribute a proportional share to the local contribution portion of freeway improvement projects to construct carpool lanes on I-80 between Highway 50/Jefferson Boulevard and Richards Boulevard, as well as to the construction of auxiliary*	CEQA SU

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		lanes between Chiles Road and Richards Boulevard. Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle on a fair share basis.	
	Modified CC	Modified *MRIC and Mace Triangle* *5-23* *The applicant shall contribute a proportional share to the local contribution portion of freeway improvement projects to construct carpool lanes on I-80 between Richards Boulevard and the causeway structure, as well as to the construction of auxiliary lanes between Chiles Road and Mace Boulevard. Responsibility for implementation of this mitigation measure shall be assigned to the MRIC and Mace Triangle site on a fair share basis.*	Modified SU
5-24 Cumulative Impacts to Regional Facilities.	CEQA LCC	CEQA *None required.*	CEQA N/A
	Modified LCC	Modified *None required.*	Modified N/A
5-25 Cumulative water system impacts.	CEQA LCC	CEQA *None required.*	CEQA N/A
	Modified LCC	Modified *None required.*	Modified N/A

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
5-26 Cumulative wastewater treatment and collection system impacts.	CEQA PCC	CEQA *MRIC* *5-26(a) Prior to approval of improvement plans for each phase of development, the applicant shall provide funding for the City to perform a WWTP analysis to identify the then-current City of Davis WWTP BOD loading capacity. If the WWTP analysis determines that adequate BOD loading capacity exists at the WWTP to serve the MRIC Project phase under review, further action is not required for the phase under review. If the analysis finds that the WWTP BOD loading capacity is not sufficient to serve the particular development phase under review, that phase of development shall not be approved until a plan, for financing and constructing additional BOD loading capacity improvements has been prepared and approved; the additional BOD loading capacity improvements have been constructed; and the City Engineer has verified that sufficient capacity exists to serve said phase.* *5-26(b) Implement Mitigation Measures 4.15-3(a) and (b).* *Mace Triangle – none*	CEQA LCC
	Modified PCC	Modified *MRIC Site*	Modified LCC

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
		5-26(a) *Prior to approval of improvement plans for each phase of development, the applicant shall provide funding for the City to perform a WWTP analysis to identify the then-current City of Davis WWTP BOD loading capacity. If the WWTP analysis determines that adequate BOD loading capacity exists at the WWTP to serve the MRIC Project phase under review, further action is not required for the phase under review. If the analysis finds that the WWTP BOD loading capacity is not sufficient to serve the particular development phase under review, that phase of development shall not be approved until a plan, for financing and constructing additional BOD loading capacity improvements has been prepared and approved; the additional BOD loading capacity improvements have been constructed; and the City Engineer has verified that sufficient capacity exists to serve said phase.* *5-26(b)* *Implement Mitigation Measures 4.15-3(a) and (b).* *Mace Triangle – none*	
5-27 The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on utilities, including solid waste, natural gas, electric, and telecommunications systems.	CEQA LCC	CEQA *None required.*	CEQA N/A
	Modified LCC	Modified *None required.*	Modified N/A

TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Level of Significance prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
6 Other CEQA Sections (MRIC and Mace Triangle)			
6.2.1 Foster population and economic growth and construction of housing.	S	*None feasible.*	SU