

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 TYPE AND PURPOSE OF THE EIR

The Village Farms Davis Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, Public Resources Code (PRC) Sections 21000-21189, as amended, and the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 14, Sections 15000-15387 (CEQA Guidelines). The City of Davis is the lead agency for the environmental review of the Village Farms Davis Project (Proposed Project) evaluated herein and has the principal responsibility for approving the Proposed Project. As required by Section 15121 of the CEQA Guidelines, this EIR will (a) inform public agency decision-makers, and the public generally, of the significant environmental effects of the project, (b) identify possible ways to minimize the significant adverse environmental effects, and (c) describe reasonable and feasible project alternatives that reduce environmental effects. The public agency shall consider the information in the EIR along with other information that may be presented to the agency and must certify the EIR prior to taking action on the project entitlements.

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

The lead agency is required to consider the information in the EIR along with any other available information in deciding whether to approve the Proposed Project. The basic requirements for an EIR include discussions of the environmental setting, environmental impacts, mitigation measures, alternatives, growth-inducing impacts, and cumulative impacts.

The CEQA Guidelines identify several types of EIRs, each applicable to different project circumstances. This EIR has been prepared as a *project-level EIR* pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15161, which is an analysis that examines the environmental impacts of a specific development project. A *project-level EIR* focuses primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from the development of the project, and examines all phases of the project, including planning, construction, and operation. The focus of the EIR, and the topics addressed herein, are described under Section 1.5, Scope of the EIR, of this chapter, below.

1.2 KNOWN RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

“Responsible agency” means a public agency that proposes to carry out or approve a project for which a lead agency is preparing or has prepared an EIR or Negative Declaration. For the purpose of CEQA, the term responsible agency includes all California public agencies other than the lead



agency that have discretionary approval power over the project or an aspect of the project. The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD), Yolo Habitat Conservancy, and Yolo Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo) are identified as potential responsible agencies.

“Trustee agency” means a State agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project, which are held in trust for the people of the State of California. The only known possible trustee agency is the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).

Although not subject to California law and, thus, outside the definitions of responsible agency or trustee agency, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) may also be called upon to grant approvals under federal law necessary for the development of the Proposed Project. The above agencies do not have duties under CEQA but, rather, are governed by a variety of federal statutes, such as the Clean Water Act, which governs the dredging and filling of waters of the U.S. (e.g., wetlands), and the federal Endangered Species Act, which requires USACE to consult with the USFWS as part of the review process for any wetland or fill permits that may be required.

1.3 PROPOSED PROJECT SUMMARY

A summary of the project location, description, and approvals is provided below. Please refer to Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR for a detailed description of the Proposed Project and entitlements, as well as a full list of the project objectives.

Project Location and Setting

The approximately 497.6-acre project site is located north of East Covell Boulevard, east of F Street, and west of Pole Line Road in a currently unincorporated portion of Yolo County, California. The project site consists of a 382.72-acre parcel identified by Assessor’s Parcel Number (APN) 035-970-033, and a 114.88-acre portion of a larger 169.9-acre parcel (APN 042-110-029) located in the northwest corner of the site. With the exception of APN 042-110-029, the project site is within the City of Davis Sphere of Influence (SOI). The Yolo County General Plan designates APN 035-970-033 as Specific Plan (S-P), and the parcel is similarly zoned S-P by the County. APN 042-110-029 is designated as Agricultural and zoned as Agricultural-Intensive (A-N) by the County.

The project site consists of generally flat, agricultural land. In addition, one agricultural structure is located in the southern portion of the site. The project site is bisected by a north-to-south private access road (L Street), which also pivots to proceed in an east-to-west direction through a portion of the site. A City of Davis drainage course (Channel A) also flows east to west through the site. Additionally, a Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) easement occurs along the western and northern site boundaries.

The project site is bounded by Pole Line Road to the east; East Covell Boulevard to the south; the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) mainline, F Street, and Cannery development to the west; and Davis Paintball, Blue Max Kart Club, and agricultural land to the north. Other surrounding uses include single- and multi-family residences, the Nugget Fields sports center, Wildhorse Golf Club, and commercial offices to the east, across Pole Line Road; and commercial uses, single- and multi-family residences, and commercial offices to the south, across East Covell Boulevard. The Davis Paintball business is located on the City’s former wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) site and the Blue Max Kart Club are located at the site of a former landfill, the Old Davis Landfill.



Proposed Project Description

In general, the Proposed Project would consist of a mixed-use development community, including a total of 1,800 dwelling units, comprised of both affordable and market-rate single- and multi-family residences, across various residential neighborhoods. In addition, the Proposed Project would include neighborhood services; public, semi-public, and educational uses; associated on-site roadway improvements; utility improvements; parks, open space, and greenbelts; and off-site improvements.

Primary site access would be provided from Pole Line Road and East Covell Boulevard. In addition, from Pole Line Road, the following roads would be extended into the site in an east-to-west direction: Moore Boulevard, Donner Avenue, and Picasso Avenue. An additional entrance from Pole Line Road would be constructed in the northeast portion of the site, providing access to a new street that would extend westward through the proposed East Village. Overall, the proposed internal streets would connect to form a semi-grid pattern within the project site. In addition, the applicant is proposing to construct new intersection improvements along Pole Line Road and a new traffic signal at the intersection of East Covell Boulevard and L Street. If determined feasible, the Proposed Project would also include a pedestrian/bicycle crossing through an undercrossing near the Pole Line Road/Moore Boulevard intersection.

The Proposed Project would require discretionary approvals, including an SOI Amendment, Annexation, General Plan Amendment, Pre-Zoning, and Development Agreement. The project would also include a Baseline Project Features agreement into which the developer would enter and be bound by to ensure inclusion of the agreed-to project features. The SOI Amendment and Annexation are ultimately subject to approval by the Yolo LAFCo. The City of Davis would be responsible for approving a resolution authorizing the project applicant to submit an SOI Amendment and Annexation application to Yolo LAFCo.

The details of the Proposed Project, including required approvals, are described in further detail in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR.

1.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES PRESERVATION ALTERNATIVE SUMMARY

This EIR also evaluates the potential physical environmental impacts associated with the Biological Resources Preservation Alternative (BRPA). The EIR evaluates the BRPA at a level equal to that of the Proposed Project. The BRPA would consist of a mixed-use development community on the same 497.6-acre project site. Similar to the Proposed Project, the BRPA would include a total of 1,800 dwelling units, comprised of both affordable and market-rate single- and multi-family residences across various residential neighborhoods. However, the BRPA would preserve a 47.1-acre Natural Habitat Area comprised of the Alkali Prairie Yolo Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (HCP/NCCP) land cover that occurs south of Channel A. In addition, the BRPA would include the development of neighborhood services; public, semi-public, and educational uses; associated on-site roadway improvements; utility improvements; parks, open space, and greenbelts; and off-site improvements.

The BRPA would require the same discretionary approvals from the City as the Proposed Project (SOI Amendment, Annexation, General Plan Amendment, Pre-zoning, Development Agreement, and Baseline Project Features agreement). The details of the BRPA, including required approvals, are described in further detail in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR.



1.5 EIR PROCESS

The EIR process begins with the decision by the lead agency to prepare an EIR, either during a preliminary review of a project or at the conclusion of an Initial Study. Once the decision is made to prepare an EIR, the lead agency sends a Notice of Preparation (NOP) to appropriate government agencies and, when required, to the State Clearinghouse (SCH) in the Office of Land Use and Climate Innovation (LCI), which will ensure that responsible and trustee State agencies reply within the required time. Please see Section 1.8 regarding the NOP process for the Proposed Project. The SCH assigns an identification number to the project, which then becomes the identification number for all subsequent environmental documents on the project. Commenting agencies have 30 days to respond to the NOP and provide information regarding alternatives and mitigation measures they wish to have explored in the Draft EIR and to provide notification regarding whether the agency will be a responsible agency or a trustee agency for the project.

As soon as the Draft EIR is completed, a Notice of Completion will be filed with the SCH and a public notice of availability will be published to inform interested parties that a Draft EIR is available for agency and public review. In addition, the notice provides information regarding the location of copies of the Draft EIR available for public review and any public meetings or hearings that are scheduled. The Draft EIR is circulated for a period of 45 days, during which time reviewers may submit comments on the document to the lead agency. The lead agency must respond to comments in writing. If significant new information, as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, is added to an EIR after public notice of availability is given but before certification of the EIR, the revised EIR or affected chapters must be recirculated for an additional public review period with related comments and responses.

A Final EIR will be prepared, containing comments and responses to comments on the Draft EIR. The Final EIR will also include any changes to the Draft EIR text made as a result of public comment, as warranted. The Final EIR will also include the Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) prepared in accordance with PRC Section 21081.6. Before approving a project, the lead agency must certify that the Final EIR has been presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency, which has reviewed and considered the EIR. The lead agency shall also certify that the Final EIR reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis.

Pursuant to CCR Title 14, Section 15091, a public agency shall not approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The findings prepared by the lead agency must be based on substantial evidence in the administrative record and must include an explanation that bridges the gap between evidence in the record and the conclusions required by CEQA. If the decision-making body elects to proceed with a project that would have unavoidable significant impacts, then a Statement of Overriding Considerations explaining the decision to balance the benefits of the project against unavoidable environmental impacts must be prepared.

1.6 SCOPE OF THE EIR

An Initial Study has not been prepared for the Proposed Project or BRPA, as the EIR addresses all CEQA-required environmental topics identified in the CEQA Guidelines. The following environmental issue areas are addressed in the EIR:



- Aesthetics;
- Agricultural Resources;
- Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Energy;
- Biological Resources;
- Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources;
- Geology and Soils;
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials;
- Hydrology and Water Quality;
- Land Use and Planning;
- Noise;
- Population and Housing;
- Public Services and Recreation;
- Transportation;
- Utilities and Service Systems; and
- Wildfire.

In addition to the foregoing resource areas, Chapter 5, Effects Not Found to be Significant, has been prepared to present information regarding resource areas that do not have the potential to be affected by the Proposed Project or BRPA.

The evaluation of effects is presented on a resource-by-resource basis in Chapters 4.1 through 4.15 of the EIR. Each chapter is divided into the following four sections: Introduction, Existing Environmental Setting, Regulatory Context, and Impacts and Mitigation Measures. Impacts that are determined to be significant in Chapters 4.1 through 4.15, and for which feasible mitigation measures are not available to reduce those impacts to a less-than-significant level, are identified as *significant and unavoidable*. Chapter 5 of the EIR presents a discussion of the environmental effects not found to be significant. Chapter 6 of the EIR presents a discussion of growth-inducing impacts, summary of cumulative impacts, and significant irreversible environmental changes associated with the project. Alternatives to the Proposed Project are discussed in Chapter 7 of the EIR, with the exception of the BRPA, which is analyzed throughout Chapters 4.1 through 4.15 at a level equal to that of the Proposed Project.

1.7 DEFINITION OF BASELINE

According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15125, an EIR must include a description of the existing physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project to provide the “baseline physical conditions” against which project-related changes can be compared. In addition, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a) states that an EIR shall identify and focus on the significant environmental effects of the Proposed Project. The CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a) states:

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

Normally, the baseline condition is the physical condition that exists when the NOP is published. The NOP for the Proposed Project was published on October 24, 2023. Therefore, conditions existing at that time are considered to be the baseline against which changes that would result from the Proposed Project or BRPA are evaluated. Impacts could include both direct and indirect



physical changes to the baseline condition. The baseline condition for the project site/BRPA site is described in Chapter 3, Project Description, of this EIR. The baseline conditions pertaining to each resource area are described in the “Existing Environmental Setting” sections throughout this EIR.

1.8 NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND SCOPING

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, an NOP was circulated to the public, local, State and federal agencies, and other known interested parties in excess of the 30-day-minimum public and agency review period from October 24, 2023 to December 8, 2023 for a total of 45 days (see Appendix A of this EIR). The purpose of the NOP was to provide notification that an EIR for the Proposed Project was being prepared and to solicit public input on the scope and content of the document.

In addition, the City of Davis held an NOP scoping meeting for the EIR during the NOP review period on November 29, 2023, for the purpose of receiving comments on the scope of the environmental analysis to be prepared for the Proposed Project. Agencies and members of the public were invited to attend and provide input on the scope of the EIR. All comments were taken into consideration during the preparation of this EIR. A summary of the NOP comments received, including the verbal comments received at the NOP scoping meeting, is provided in Section 1.9 below.

1.9 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE NOP

During the NOP public review period from October 24, 2023 to December 8, 2023, the City of Davis received 74 comment letters. Two additional letters were received after the close of the public review period, for a total of 76 comment letters. In addition, 11 written comment cards were received at the public scoping meeting held on November 29, 2023. A copy of each letter is provided in Appendix B of this EIR. The comment letters and verbal comments received were issued by the following representatives of public agencies and groups, as well as individual members of the general public:

Public Agencies

- California Department of Conservation – Monique Wilber;
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) – Gary Arnold;
- CDFW – Tanya Sheya;
- Central Valley RWQCB – Peter Minkel;
- Davis Joint Unified School District (DJUSD) – Bruce Colby;
- Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) – Pricilla Torres-Fuentes;
- Yolo County Department of Community Services – Leslie Lindbo;
- Yolo County Environmental Health Division – Suzie Dawley;
- Yolo Habitat Conservancy – Charlie Tschudin;
- Yolo LAFCo – Christine Crawford; and
- Yolo Transportation District – Brian Abbanat.

Groups

- Davis Community Action Network – Judy Ennis;
- North Davis Land Company LLC – Lydia Delis-Schlosser;
- R&B Delta – Marissa C. Fuentes, Taylor and Wiley; and
- Sierra Club Yolano Group.



Residents

- Adriana and Frank Khan;
- Alan Pryor;
- Alex Achimore (2);
- Alexa Bach-McElrone;
- Ann Privateer;
- Anne Myler;
- Ari Halberstadt;
- Betty Masuoka;
- BJ Klosterman;
- Callie Garritson;
- Carol Hillhouse;
- Carroll Cook;
- Charles Pickett;
- David J. Thompson;
- Dolores Blake;
- Eileen M. Samitz (2);
- Fei Li;
- George A. Barnett;
- George Heubeck;
- Georgina Valencia;
- Ginga Zeidenberg Strozyk and Kinuko Yoshida;
- Glen;
- Glen Holstein;
- Greg Rowe (3);
- James Flanigan;
- Jean Jackman;
- John Johnston;
- John Zeller;
- Judith Blum;
- Kees Hood;
- Keirsten Taillon;
- Kenneth LaGrone;
- Larry Strozyk;
- Laura Eisen;
- Margo Surovik Bohnert;
- Mike Lehner (3);
- Mohammad Sadoghi;
- Nancy Price;
- Norb Kumagai;
- Pam Heffley;
- Rena Nayyar (2);
- Richard McCann;
- Robert J. Coolbrith and Elizabeth Coolbrith;
- Ron Oertel;
- Sara Zeidenberg;
- Sherrill Futrell (2);



- Susan Rainier;
- Tim Keller;
- Tom & Sandy Jones;
- Vern Goehring; and
- Zachary Horton.

Scoping Meeting Written Comments

- Ashutosh Srivastava;
- Cai Thorman;
- Dave Bakay;
- Elizabeth Reay;
- Ellen Kolarik;
- Greg Rowe;
- Judith Feldman;
- Konshau Williams Duman;
- Peter Holman;
- Stephen Wheeler; and
- Susan Rainer.

Letters Received After the Public Comment Period

- Alex Achimore; and
- Eileen M. Samitz.

The following list, categorized by issue, summarizes the environmental concerns brought forth in the comment letters received on the scope of the EIR. Comments outside of the purview of CEQA or that are speculative in nature have not been included, as, according to Section 15145 of CEQA Guidelines, CEQA does not require evaluation of speculative impacts.

<p><u>Aesthetics</u> (Chapter 4.1)</p>	<p>Concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse aesthetic impacts of working and living near parking lots. • The Proposed Project’s visual character and consistency with City standards. • Permanent loss of views from La Buena Vida residences of existing fields and sunsets.
<p><u>Agricultural Resources</u> (Chapter 4.2)</p>	<p>Concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permanent conversion of agricultural land and the need to preserve such land. • Use of the off-site area as agricultural mitigation. • Increasing the agricultural buffer from the minimum. • Compliance with the County’s Right-to-Farm Ordinance. • Water retention basins qualifying as agricultural mitigation. • Preservation of the land north of Channel A as agricultural mitigation and open space. • Impacts to open space at the north end of the Cannery designated as Urban Agricultural Transition Area (UATA).



<p><u>Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Energy</u> (Chapter 4.3)</p>	<p>Concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducting a health risk assessment (HRA) at busy intersections to evaluate health risks associated with air pollutants. • How the project and alternatives advance or inhibit the City's ability to achieve its climate goals as documented in the City's Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP). • Air quality impacts on children and seniors living in proximity to the project site. • Air quality impacts associated with an increased number of vehicle trips. • Construction stirring up dust and soil, requiring site preparation to avoid impacting surrounding areas. • Generation of significant greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. • Inclusion of GHG reduction measures consistent with City's CAAP in a Transportation Demand Management (TDM). • Consistency with all Tier 1 requirements established by the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) and all City of Davis residential and commercial Energy Reach Code standards. • Provision of a renewable energy microgrid to reduce emissions. • Support for electric vehicles (EVs), public transport charging, and bidirectional charging.
<p><u>Biological Resources</u> (Chapter 4.4)</p>	<p>Concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preservation of open space and wildlife habitat, including the on-site vernal pools in the northwest portion of the project site and other aquatic resources (e.g., streambeds). • Impacts to protected wildlife and plant species. • Environmental evaluation should be performed with the Yolo Regional Resource Conservation Investment Strategy/Land Conservation Plan (RCIS/LCP) and Yolo HCP/NCCP in mind. • Unique alkali soil-type vernal pools that provide suitable habitat for many special-status plant and wildlife species. • The amount of natural habitat incorporated into the development. • Wetland delineation should take historical photos and previous EIRs (including the 2004 Covell Village Project EIR) into consideration. • Trees should be preserved in the southern portion of the site, along Channel A, and along the railroad tracks to the west.
<p><u>Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources</u> (Chapter 4.5)</p>	<p>Concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tribal consultation should be conducted. • Notification and consultation should be sent to the Yoche Dehe Wintun Nation and other tribal groups. • A hand-made gravestone/memorial with cross inset and plaque is located under the oldest oak in the southern portion of the site, indicating a potential grave.
<p><u>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</u> (Chapter 4.7)</p>	<p>Concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential contamination impacts associated with the adjacent landfill site and associated wells located northeast of the project site. • Waste cell boundaries may need to be delineated to determine gas monitoring well locations. • Existing toxins/contaminants flowing through on-site stormwater system into the wetlands east of the City of Davis.



<p><u>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</u> (Chapter 4.7)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance with any applicable buffer requirements between residential areas and the former landfill and WWTP. • Contamination impacts associated with locating the proposed groundwater recapture basins in proximity to the former landfill site. • Potential effects associated with existing contaminants, if any, within the project site. • Potential effects associated with existing PG&E gas pipeline.
<p><u>Hydrology and Water Quality</u> (Chapter 4.8)</p>	<p>Concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether a groundwater recharge basin would retain stormwater. • Regional effects of widening Channel A. • Ensuring off-site runoff does not increase. • Impacts associated with constructing in a floodplain, including contributions to flood risks in the rest of the City. • Drainage Report should include analysis of a 200-year flood event and a 100-year flood event. • Incorporation of flood zone features, such as elevated foundations. • Stormwater runoff should be captured by bioretention facilities for filtration, flood prevention, and providing groundwater recharge. • Distinguishing between off-site retention basins versus on-site flood control and drainage systems. • Location of a PG&E pipeline through the project site, and potential conflicts with proposed water recharge basins, retention basins, and/or detention basins. • Surface water versus well water for landscaping and irrigation, and surface water capacity. • Impacts associated with exclusively using surface water. • Potential impacts to the Cannery well water supply. • Ability to efficiently use water, maintain water quality, and avoid impacts to water supply. • Contaminants in stormwater and the associated impacts to people, wildlife, and groundwater. • Impacts to the drainage canal at the boundary of the Cannery. • Impacts to the quality of surface and groundwater.
<p><u>Land Use and Planning</u> (Chapter 4.9)</p>	<p>Concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency with Davis General Plan policies associated with the environment.
<p><u>Noise</u> (Chapter 4.10)</p>	<p>Concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction causing noise pollution for existing neighborhoods. • Noise levels associated with increased traffic on Pole Line Road.
<p><u>Public Services and Recreation</u> (Chapter 4.12)</p>	<p>Concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impacts on student enrollment in district public schools, and the resultant need to construct a new elementary school. • Emergency response times outside the five-minute response goal due to increased population associated with the Proposed Project.
<p><u>Transportation</u> (Chapter 4.13)</p>	<p>Concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cyclist/pedestrian safety hazards due to traffic increases. • Impacts on safe routes to schools. • Potential restoration of bus lines and relationship to the Proposed Project. • Impacts related to traffic safety and vehicle miles traveled (VMT). • Traffic increases on County roads within the vicinity of the site. • Compliance with City roadway standards.



<p><u>Transportation</u> (Chapter 4.13)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation mitigation should minimize walking distance to public transit. • Preparation of a TDM plan consistent with City's CAAP. • Bicycle facilities and infrastructure, including accessible sidewalks, throughout the project site. • Traffic impacts associated with the proposed roundabouts. • Right-of-way issues and potential limitations associated with the widening of East Covell Boulevard and Pole Line Road. • Accurate assessment of VMT. • Cumulative traffic impacts associated with planned commercial development at the south end of the Cannery at East Covell Boulevard.
<p><u>Utilities and Service Systems</u> (Chapter 4.14)</p>	<p>Concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential impacts to the City's water supply. • Potential impacts to the City's wastewater treatment capacity. • The nature, timing, and funding of utilities. • Adequate infrastructure to support the proposed housing units.
<p><u>Alternatives Analysis</u> (Chapter 7)</p>	<p>Concerns related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of alternatives that preserve the vernal pool area and wildlife habitat south of Channel A, including reduced acreage alternatives. • Consideration of alternative locations and zoning densities, including an alternative replacing low-density housing areas with medium- and high-density to avoid wildlife habitat areas. • Consideration of alternatives that would emphasize alternative transportation modes. • Consideration of alternatives related to energy use and renewable energy sources. • Consideration of modified alternatives from the 2004 Covell Village Project EIR. • Including drainage system options in each of the project alternatives. • The majority of the alternatives not constituting lesser impacts. • 1,800 units on 135 acres being an infeasible alternative given the relative lack of open space involved. • Consideration of an alternative dividing the Proposed Project into two projects. • Consideration of an alternative to replace the proposed fire station with an EMT station.

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

1.10 DRAFT EIR AND PUBLIC REVIEW

This Draft EIR is being circulated for public review and comment for a period of 45 days. During this period, the general public, organizations, and agencies can submit comments to the Lead Agency on the Draft EIR's accuracy and completeness. Release of the Draft EIR marks the beginning of a 45-day public review period pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15105. The public can review the Draft EIR through the City's website at:

<https://www.cityofdavis.org/city-hall/community-development/development-projects/village-farms-davis>



or at the following address during normal business hours:

City of Davis
Department of Community Development
23 Russell Blvd, Suite 2
Davis, CA 95616

All comments or questions regarding the Draft EIR should be submitted in written form and addressed to:

Dara Dungworth, Principal Planner
City of Davis, Department of Community Development
(530) 757-5610
ddungworth@cityofdavis.org

1.11 ORGANIZATION OF THE DRAFT EIR

The EIR is organized into the following sections:

Chapter 1 – Introduction

Provides an introduction and overview describing the intended use of the EIR and the review and certification process, as well as summaries of the chapters included in the EIR and summaries of the issues and concerns received from the public and public agencies during the NOP review period.

Chapter 2 – Executive Summary

Summarizes the elements of the project and the environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the Proposed Project and BRPA, describes proposed mitigation measures and indicates the level of significance of impacts after mitigation. In addition, the Executive Summary chapter includes a summary of the alternatives to the Proposed Project and BRPA, and areas of known controversy.

Chapter 3 – Project Description

Provides a detailed description of the Proposed Project and BRPA, including the location, background information, major objectives, and technical characteristics of the Proposed Project and BRPA.

Chapter 4 – Existing Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation

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

Chapter 5 – Effects Not Found to be Significant

The Effects Not Found to be Significant chapter of the EIR addresses the project's effects that were determined not to be significant for the Proposed Project and BRPA. CEQA Guidelines Section 15128 requires a brief discussion explaining why these effects were not found to be significant.



Chapter 6 – Statutorily Required Sections

The Statutorily Required Sections chapter of the EIR provides discussions required by CEQA regarding impacts that would result from the Proposed Project and BRPA, including a summary of cumulative impacts, potential growth-inducing impacts, significant and unavoidable impacts, and significant irreversible changes to the environment.

Chapter 7 – Alternatives Analysis

The Alternatives Analysis chapter of the EIR describes and evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Project. The alternatives are analyzed at a level of detail less than that of the Proposed Project; however, the analyses include sufficient detail to allow for a meaningful comparison of impacts. The exception is the BRPA, which is evaluated throughout the Draft EIR in Chapters 4.1 through 4.15 instead of in the Alternatives Analysis chapter of the Draft EIR.

Chapter 8 – EIR Authors and Persons Consulted

The EIR Authors and Persons Consulted chapter of the EIR lists EIR and technical report authors who provided technical assistance in the preparation and review of the EIR.

Chapter 9 – References

The References chapter of the EIR provides bibliographic information for all references and resources cited.

Appendices

The Appendices include the NOP, comments received during the NOP comment period, and technical reports prepared for the Proposed Project and BRPA.

