

Errata to UC Davis Long Range Development Plan Draft EIR

After Final EIR Volume III was reproduced, the University discovered the following corrections to the EIR, which are shown below.

Table 2-2 Comparison of NMP Alternatives (page 2-7 through 2-14)

In the Final EIR, the following errors were the result of oversights during revision, and in one case a clerical error. The changes made are shown as deletions and insertions in the attached corrected table.

This table lists the impacts of the proposed project that are significant or potentially significant before mitigation, and compares the relative level of significance of impacts that would be expected to result from each of the project alternatives. "M" indicates more significant than the proposed project, "L" indicates less significant, "E" indicates equal, and "NI" indicates that no impact would result from that alternative.

Hydrology Impact NMP 2.4-22 was incorrectly designated "M" under the No Project Alternative. The correct designation was "NI".

Noise Impact NMP 2.3-25, which addresses traffic noise impacts associated with the implementation of the project, was inadvertently left off the table. The relative impacts of each alternative as shown in the table are consistent with the discussion in the text of the Final EIR as published.

Under Traffic, Circulation and Parking, all three impacts listed should have been indicated as "M" for the No Project Alternative, as discussed in the text of the Final EIR as published, rather than "NI" as incorrectly shown in the table as published.

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of NMP Alternatives**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Neighborhood Housing	Alternative 2 Olive Tree Drive	Alternative 3 North-South Orientation	Alternative 4 Central Campus Infill	Alternative 5 Higher Density	Alternative 6 No Project
2.4.1 Aesthetics							
NMP 2.4-1: Implementation of the NMP would substantially degrade scenic vistas from the central campus and surrounding areas across agricultural lands to the Coast Range mountains west of Davis.	S	L	M	L	L	M	NI
NMP 2.4-2: Implementation of the NMP would degrade the visual character of the project site and its surroundings by substantially degrading the valued elements of the visual landscape identified in the 2003 LRDP.	PS	L	M	E	E	M	NI
NMP 2.4-3: Implementation of the NMP would create new sources of substantial light or glare that could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	PS	L	M	E	M	M	NI
2.4.2 Agricultural Resources							
NMP 2.4-4: Implementation of the NMP would convert approximately 225 acres of prime farmland (as defined by the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program) to nonagricultural uses.	S	L	M	E	L	L	NI
2.4.3 Air Quality							
NMP 2.4-5: Construction activities at the NMP site would result in short-term emissions of criteria air pollutants.	S	L	M	E	E	L	NI

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of NMP Alternatives**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Neighborhood Housing	Alternative 2 Olive Tree Drive	Alternative 3 North-South Orientation	Alternative 4 Central Campus Infill	Alternative 5 Higher Density	Alternative 6 No Project
NMP 2.4-6: Routine activities at the NMP site would result in increased operational emissions of criteria air pollutants.	S	M	M	E	E	E	M
2.4.4 Biological Resources							
NMP 2.4-7: Implementation of the NMP would result in the conversion of approximately 225 acres of agricultural land and ruderal/annual grassland habitat suitable for western burrowing owl.	PS	L	M	E	L	L	NI
NMP 2.4-8: Development under the NMP could result in the failure of nesting efforts by Swainson's hawk or other birds of prey	PS	L	M	E	E	E	NI
NMP 2.4-9: Development under the NMP would result in the loss of potential VELB habitat.	PS	L	E	E	E	L	NI
NMP 2.4-10: Development of offsite utilities for the NMP could result in the loss of potential habitat for the northwestern pond turtle.	PS	E	E	E	L	E	NI

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of NMP Alternatives**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Neighborhood Housing	Alternative 2 Olive Tree Drive	Alternative 3 North-South Orientation	Alternative 4 Central Campus Infill	Alternative 5 Higher Density	Alternative 6 No Project
NMP 2.4-11: Development of offsite utilities for the NMP could result in the adverse modification of wetlands and other waters of the U.S. that fall under the jurisdiction of the ACOE and/or CDFG.	PS	E	E	E	L	E	NI
NMP 2.4-12: Construction of the NMP storm drain outfall on Putah Creek could potentially affect special status fish species.	PS	E	E	E	L	E	NI
2.4.5 Cultural Resources							
NMP 2.4-14: Implementation of the NMP could damage or destroy an archaeological resource or human remains as a result of grading, excavation, ground disturbance, or other project development.	PS	L	M	M	M	L	NI
2.4.7 Hazardous Materials							
NMP 2.4-15: Development approved under the NMP could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the use, transport or disposal of hazardous material by non-UC entities on campus.	PS	E	E	E	E	E	NI

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of NMP Alternatives**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Neighborhood Housing	Alternative 2 Olive Tree Drive	Alternative 3 North-South Orientation	Alternative 4 Central Campus Infill	Alternative 5 Higher Density	Alternative 6 No Project
NMP 2.4-17: Implementation of the NMP could expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated soil or groundwater.	PS	L	M	E	L	L	NI
NMP 2.4-18: Implementation of the NMP would include campus development in the vicinity of the University Airport, which could result in safety hazards for people residing or working in the area, and would include lighting or recreation fields that could result in a glare hazard for aircraft.	PS	E	M	E	L	E	NI
NMP 2.4-19: Development of the NMP could physically interfere with the campus' Emergency Operations Plan.	PS	L	M	M	M	E	NI

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of NMP Alternatives**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Neighborhood Housing	Alternative 2 Olive Tree Drive	Alternative 3 North-South Orientation	Alternative 4 Central Campus Infill	Alternative 5 Higher Density	Alternative 6 No Project
2.4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality							
NMP 2.4-22: Implementation of the NMP Project would increase the amount of water extracted from the shallow/intermediate and deep aquifers and would increase impervious surfaces. Extraction from the aquifers could deplete groundwater levels and could contribute to local subsidence, and increased impervious surface coverage could interfere substantially with recharge. This could result in a net deficit in the aquifers or a lowering of the local groundwater table.	S	L	M	E	L	L	<u>NIM</u>
2.4.10 Noise							
NMP 2.4-24: Construction activities at the NMP site could result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.	PS	L	M	E	M	E	NI
NMP 2.4-25: <u>Traffic to and from the NMP site could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.</u>	<u>PS</u>	<u>L</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>M</u>

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of NMP Alternatives**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Neighborhood Housing	Alternative 2 Olive Tree Drive	Alternative 3 North-South Orientation	Alternative 4 Central Campus Infill	Alternative 5 Higher Density	Alternative 6 No Project
2.4.12 Public Services							
NMP 2.4-28: If the City of Davis Fire Department provides service to the proposed Neighborhood, implementation of the NMP would result in significant environmental impacts to prime farmland and habitat, associated with the provision of new or altered facilities in order to maintain the department's preferred response standard.	S	L	E	E	L	E	NI
2.4.14 Traffic, Circulation and Parking							
NMP 2.4-31: Implementation of the NMP would cause unacceptable intersection LOS.	S	M	M	E	E	E	NM
NMP 2.4-32: Implementation of NMP could create additional parking demand.	S	M	M	E	E	E	NM
NMP 2.4-33: Implementation of the NMP would result in increased conflicts between bicyclists, pedestrians, and motor vehicles, and cause increased congestion and safety problems.	S	M	M	E	E	E	NM

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of NMP Alternatives**

Impact	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Neighborhood Housing	Alternative 2 Olive Tree Drive	Alternative 3 North-South Orientation	Alternative 4 Central Campus Infill	Alternative 5 Higher Density	Alternative 6 No Project
2.4.15 Utilities							
NMP 2.4-35: Implementation of the NMP would require the expansion of natural gas transmission systems, which could result in impacts to a significant archaeological resource.	PS	E	E	E	L	E	NI