

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

Based on internal review and in response to comments received, the text published in Volumes I, II, and III of the Draft EIR has been revised. Changes to the wording of impact or mitigation statements and material added or deleted to the impact analyses and discussions are presented below with changes shown in underscore and strikeout, so that the original and revised text may be compared. In some sections, only editorial or other insubstantive changes have been made. These revisions are not shown in detail in this section.

Changes are presented here by volume, and by sections within each volume. Those sections where no substantive changes were made are listed at the end of each volume section.

3.1 CHANGES TO VOLUME I

DRAFT EIR SECTION 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Text in this section has been updated to reflect completion of the Draft EIR circulation process and the inclusion of Volumes IV and V in this Final EIR.

DRAFT EIR SECTION 2.0 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

This section of the Draft EIR has also been updated based on comments received and internal review. Changes to this section are not shown below but are essentially the same as the changes made to the statements of impacts and mitigation measures that are presented by resource topic below. Changes were made in a few impact statements, as summarized in Table 2-1, to clarify impact language or mitigation measures, or to increase the effectiveness of mitigation. In no case do these alterations reflect an assessment of increased impact significance or severity. Minor editorial changes are not detailed here. The following changes have been made to Table 2-1:

Aesthetics

LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(d) was added to further reduce light and glare impacts. There were no changes in impact significance or severity.

Agricultural Resources

LRDP Mitigation 4.2-1 was amended to include the potential use of the McConeghy and Kidwell parcels for agricultural mitigation. There were no changes in impact significance or severity.

Air Quality

A stipulation was added to LRDP Mitigation 4.3-1(a) to further reduce emissions from vehicular sources.

The LRDP Mitigation 4.3-3(a) stipulation regarding off-site transport of materials was amended to increase container freeboard space to further reduce potential dust emissions.

Volume IV

A stipulation was added to LRDP Mitigation 4.3-3(b), limiting the area of construction near receptors at any given time, to further reduce impacts from construction emissions.

There were no changes in impact significance or severity.

Biological Resources

Text of LRDP Mitigation 4.4-2 was revised to include the potential use of the McConeghy and/or Kidwell parcels for habitat mitigation, to increase mitigation acreage, and to describe the acreage in more detail.

Text of LRDP Mitigations 4.4-3(c) and (d) was changed to more accurately describe the use of CDFG guidelines. In addition, one stipulation was amended and another was added to item (d) to increase the effectiveness of burrowing owl mitigation.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-4(b) was amended to increase the effectiveness of Swainson's hawk nesting mitigations, to add qualifications for the project biologist, and to improve the monitoring process.

LRDP Impact 4.4-5 was amended for clarity by the substitution of the phrase "active nest sites" for "nest trees."

In the Draft EIR, LRDP Impact 4.4-9 erroneously had been called potentially significant before mitigation, although the text that follows indicates a less-than-significant impact. This was corrected in the Final EIR to indicate a less-than-significant impact before mitigation.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-10(b) was expanded with new stipulations that increase the effectiveness of silt control.

In LRDP Impact 4.4-11, the definition of a Heritage tree was amended to describe oaks that are 33 inches *or greater* in diameter.

Explanatory text under LRDP Mitigation 4.4-11 was augmented with the statement that valley oaks would be planted in the habitat mitigation area in an effort to partially reduce potential impacts to heritage trees. The impact remains significant and unavoidable.

There were no changes in impact significance or severity.

Cultural Resources

Text was added to LRDP Mitigation 4.5-4(c) to clarify legal regulation and campus procedures for the protection of human remains. There was no change in impact significance or severity.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

A stipulation (v) was added to LRDP Mitigation 4.7-10 to clarify the procedures through which handling of hazardous materials by non-UC entities would be regulated.

The text of LRDP Impact 4.7-15 was amended to recognize a potential aircraft hazard from light or glare. A stipulation (b) was added to LRDP Mitigation 4.7-15 to address this issue. A stipulation (c) also was added to the impact to ensure that Neighborhood residents are made aware of the proximity of the University Airport.

There were no changes in impact significance or severity.

Noise

LRDP Mitigations 4.10-2 (a through d) were reorganized into Mitigations (a) and (b). Text was added to explain the campus' fair share contribution to the City of Davis' noise abatement program for Russell Boulevard. Previous mitigation (c) was eliminated as it addressed noise impacts at a location on campus that had been erroneously identified on the basis of an incorrect application of noise significance criteria. No impact would occur at this location.

There were no changes in impact significance or severity.

Traffic

The texts of LRDP Impacts 4.14-1 and 4.14-2 were amended to reflect the fact that the NMP vehicular connection to Russell Boulevard is no longer under consideration.

Utilities

LRDP Impact 4.15-7 was noted in error in the Draft EIR as "potentially significant" before mitigation. This determination was corrected to "significant" in the Final EIR. In either case, the impact remains "significant and unavoidable" after mitigation.

DRAFT EIR SECTION 3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The following changes to the Project Description of the Draft EIR are the result of internal review and comments received on the Draft EIR.

In Section 3.2, page 3-2, the text has been amended to reflect the potential acquisition of additional parcels for agricultural mitigation.

The University of California currently has options to purchase agricultural properties located near the campus, including the 551-acre Kidwell parcel and the 294-acre McConeghy parcel, both located south of the central campus. Both of these parcels consist of prime farmland. The 2003 LRDP does not identify land uses for these parcels because the University does not own any of the parcels, and the LRDP does not propose uses on these parcels as part of the overall growth program. However, these parcels potentially could be purchased for future campus uses like those proposed for Russell Ranch, including agricultural mitigation.

Volume IV

An extended list of workshops and meetings has been provided in Section 3.3, page 3-3 and following, in response to a number of comments on the planning process.

- May 28-29, 2002 (two workshops): Two refined LRDP and three refined NMP options were presented at information stations, goals and issues were discussed during a presentation, and a public discussion identified key comments and concerns.
- The following public meetings were held after the DEIR was published:
- April 23, 2003: The Draft LRDP and NMP were presented and discussed in front of the Davis City Council.
- May 5 and 20, 2003 (two presentations): The Draft LRDP and NMP were presented and discussed in front of the Davis Open Space Commission.
- May 8, 2003: The Draft LRDP and NMP were presented and discussed in front of the Davis Recreation and Park Commission.
- May 13, 2003: The Draft LRDP and NMP were presented and discussed in front of the Davis Planning Commission.
- May 14, 2003: The Draft LRDP and NMP were presented and discussed in front of the Davis League of Women Voters.
- May 15, 2003: The Draft LRDP and NMP were presented and discussed in front of the Davis Safety Advisory Commission.
- May 19, 2003: The Draft LRDP and NMP were presented and discussed in front of the Davis Business and Economic Development Commission.
- May 22, 2003: The Draft LRDP and NMP were presented and discussed in front of the Davis Natural Resources Commission.
- June 2, 2003 (first public hearing): Information was presented and formal testimony was recorded at two public hearings.
- June 3, 2003: The Draft LRDP and NMP were presented and discussed in front of the Davis Chamber of Commerce.
- June 3, 2003: The Draft LRDP and NMP were presented and discussed in front of the Yolo County Board of Supervisors.
- June 9, 2003: The Draft LRDP and NMP were presented and discussed in front of the Davis Finance and Budget Commission.
- July 10, 2003: A public workshop to discuss a potential Neighborhood connection to Russell Boulevard was attempted.
- July 12, 2003: The Draft LRDP and NMP were presented and discussed in front of the Yolo County Planning Commission.
- July 24, 2003: A public workshop was held to discuss aspects of the proposed neighborhood with the West Davis community.
- July 28, 2003: Final testimony was recorded at a second public hearing.

Minor revisions were made to Table 3-3, page 3-17, to correct errors and reflect small changes made during the planning process, in the acreage of several land use designations.

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

**Table 3-3
Acreage by Land Use Category**

Land Use Category	2001-2002 Existing Land Use	2003 LRDP Land Use Designation
Academic/Administrative–High Density	293	441
Academic/Administrative–Low Density	293	317 316
Agricultural Research Reserve	1,381	0
Community Gardens	12	10
Elementary School	0	3
Faculty and Staff Housing	6	79 77
Formal Open Space	20	67 69
Major Roads, Levees, etc.	111 108	135 132
Mixed-Use Housing	0	6
Parking	79	92
Physical Education/Intercollegiate Athletics/Recreation	107	195
Research Park–High Density (formerly Enterprise Reserve)	0	12
Research Park–Low Density (formerly Enterprise Reserve)	0	33
Student Housing	118	167
Support Services	213	242
Teaching and Research Fields	2,214	2,718 2,722
Teaching and Research Open Space	376	759 757
Undeveloped Open Space	<u>54</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	5,274	5,274

Section 3.8.12 (page 3-26) was revised in response to comment SA-5-2, to clarify a statement about UC Davis’ long-range agricultural lands.

In anticipation of future campus growth needs, ~~the LRDP also calls for a long-range agricultural land planning study~~ was conducted by the College of Agriculture during the LRDP planning process. The study identified which agricultural activities in the college need to remain at their current sites long-term, and which activities have the flexibility to be moved in the short-term. The results of this study informed the locations and configurations of the proposed NMP and the NMP alternatives that are evaluated in this document. ~~to examine current land use patterns and create a strategic plan for the future and long term use of agricultural land resources at UC Davis~~

Section 3.11, Volume I was expanded as shown below in response to a number of comments, to provide more detail about the University’s sustainable development policy.

The concept of sustainable development relates to development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the needs of future generations. The Governor’s Executive Order D-16-00, which became effective August 2, 2000, establishes the following sustainable building goal: “...to

site, design, deconstruct, construct, renovate, operate, and maintain state buildings that are models of energy, water, and materials efficiency; while providing healthy, productive and comfortable indoor environments and long-term benefits to Californians.” While this Executive Order is only advisory with respect to the University of California, the University encourages design elements and operations that are intended to help provide for a sustainable environment. UC Davis implements design elements and operations that are intended to help provide for a sustainable environment, including those that apply at building specific and campus wide levels.

In June 2003, the UC Regents adopted a UC-wide green building policy and clean energy standard. The policy encourages principles of energy efficiency and sustainability in the planning, financing, design, construction, renewal, maintenance, operation, space management, facilities utilization and decommissioning of facilities and infrastructure to the extent possible, consistent with budgetary constraints and regulatory and programmatic requirements. In addition, the policy aims to minimize increased use of non-renewable energy by encouraging programs addressing energy efficiency, local renewable power and green power purchases from the electrical grid (UC Office of the president 2003). Growth under the 2003 LRDP would be required to comply with this policy.

~~In response to the Governor’s Order, the energy market, and direction from the campus leadership, UC Davis formed an Energy Advisory Committee in March 2001 to provide guidance for long-term energy policy and operational practices, including those that relate to green energy alternatives, new building design, building operation, energy efficient purchases, measuring and monitoring energy use, reward systems for conservation, and energy communication. In addition, the University of California is currently evaluating system wide principles and policies associated with sustainable development that will provide additional direction for the campus.~~

In addition, ~~a~~As discussed further in Section 4.14 Traffic, Circulation, and Parking (Volume II), the campus currently reduces dependency on the automobile by providing expansive bicycle and pedestrian systems and providing the main local transit system for UC Davis and the City of Davis. As discussed further in Section 4.15 Utilities (Volume II), the campus promotes water and energy conservation, has an extensive recycling program, and provides heating and cooling to most central campus buildings via the energy-efficient chilled water and steam systems.

In addition to compliance with the University’s new green building and clean energy policies and continuation of UC Davis~~these~~ sustainable practices, the 2003 LRDP includes several objectives that address sustainable development, including those related to providing a healthy and interconnected natural and built environment, conserving water and energy, maintaining the quality of stormwater and wastewater discharges, providing habitat and agricultural reserves, clustering development and preserving farmlands, supporting bikes and pedestrians, providing incentives to decrease single-occupancy driving, converting to alternate fuel vehicles, supporting transit systems, and maintaining open spaces. In addition, the campus will incorporate design features, such as solar and wind optimization, that support the concept of sustainable development. The proposed NMP, described further in Section 2 Neighborhood Master Plan (Volume III), incorporates such environmentally sustainable features.

The following reference cited in Section 3.11 was added to the LRDP EIR.

UC Office of the President. 2003. Update on Feasibility Study to Recommend a Systemwide Green Building Policy and Clean Energy Standard. June 2, 2003.

DRAFT EIR SECTION 4.1 AESTHETICS

The following changes to Section 4.1 (Aesthetics) of Volume I of the Draft EIR are the result of internal review and comments received on the Draft EIR.

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

The following text was added to Section 4.1.1.5, Design Review Process (Page 4.1-5), in response to a number of comments, to provide more information on the design review process.

Campus design standards and plans that provide the basis for design review include the Campus Standards & Design Guide manual, which has been in place and updated annually since 1994 and provides a list of required products and mandatory design constraints for all construction use on campus, the campus Architectural Design Guidelines (final design guidelines are anticipated to be adopted in fall 2003), and the Core Campus Plan (final anticipated to be in place in fall 2003). Additional guidelines include the campus Architectural Design Guidelines used by the Architects and Engineers Office to communicate design objectives to consulting architects and further used by the Design Review committee to evaluate proposed architectural designs. The identification of site locations for future buildings, as well as the relationships among buildings, open spaces, and circulation within the central campus is provided by the Campus Core Study. This study was completed by Sasaki Associates in December of 2001. This study is used by the Office of Resource Management and Planning as a guideline for recommendations to University decision makers to assure an integrated environment of buildings, open spaces, and circulation routes. This study is updated and refined as more detailed site plans are developed by the Office of Resource Management and Planning for specific campus neighborhoods or districts. These planning guidelines helped to inform the proposed 2003 LRDP land use plan, and also provide more detailed information to guide the design and evaluation of new core campus development projects within the land use context set by the LRDP.

An additional measure was added to LRDP Mitigation 4.1.3, in response to comments, to ensure that 2003 LRDP lighting design and equipment requirements will be applied to older lighting as it is replaced over time, as well as to new lighting. The addition of this measure did not alter the significance of LRDP Impact 4.1-3 or the residual significance after mitigation.

LRDP Mitigation 4.1-3(d): The campus will implement the use of the specified lighting design and equipment when older lighting fixtures and designs are replaced over time.

DRAFT EIR SECTION 4.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

The following changes to Agricultural Resources, Section 4.2, Volume I of the Draft EIR are the result of internal review and comments received on the Draft EIR.

The following text was added to Section 4.2.2.4 (Impacts and Mitigation Measures), page 4.2-10, in response to several comments, to explain the mechanism through which LRDP Mitigation 4.2-1 would be implemented in order to preserve prime farmland. Neither the significance of LRDP Impact 4.2-1 nor the mitigation measure is altered in any way: the discussion simply explains in more detail how the mitigation would be implemented.

The University would use one of two possible mechanisms to preserve the prime farmland: (1) the campus would create an overlay on the designated 525 acres as an agricultural preserve on Russell Ranch and/or at the alternate off-campus sites. The LRDP overlay would clearly identify the types of uses that would be allowed and those that would not be allowed on these lands, and would require that an LRDP amendment with Regental approval would be necessary to make any modifications/revisions to this designation any time during the timeline of the 2003 LRDP or after. An amendment of the LRDP would require review under CEQA. Alternately, (2) the campus would record an agricultural conservation easement/deed restriction for the agricultural preserve site(s) with the county clerk, and establish procedures in the 2003 LRDP to inform future campus planners of the agricultural easement and the development restrictions on the identified lands. The

Volume IV

preservation will be timed to occur before any farmland is converted to nonagricultural uses under the 2003 LRDP.

DRAFT EIR SECTION 4.3 AIR QUALITY

The following changes to Air Quality, Section 4.2, page 4.3-22 of Volume I of the Draft EIR are the result of internal review and comments received on the Draft EIR.

An additional stipulation was added to LRDP Mitigation 4.3-1(a) to further reduce future campus contribution to the violation of air quality standards. This addition does not result in a change in the significance of the impact either before or after mitigation.

- When the campus purchases new vehicles, the campus will evaluate the practicality and feasibility of acquiring low-pollution vehicles that are appropriate for the task and will purchase these types of vehicles when practical and feasible. When replacing diesel engines in existing equipment, the campus will install up-to-date technology.

Table 4.3-8 was amended as shown below. First, an errata published with the Draft EIR included a clarification of the data in the table to allow the reader to better understand the estimates presented. A row of data from an LRDP scenario not pertinent to the impact analysis was deleted. Subsequently, to provide a better understanding of the reduction in LRDP emissions from the inclusion of the NMP, a row was added to the table in the Final EIR to report projected vehicular emissions from LRDP implementation without the NMP. These revisions do not alter the significance or increase the severity of the air quality impacts.

Table 4.3-8
Daily Vehicular Emissions Associated with the 2003 LRDP
(in lbs/day)

Scenario	NO _x	ROG	PM ₁₀	CO	SO ₂
<u>2015 No Project</u> <u>Vehicle Emissions</u> <u>due to 2003 LRDP</u>	<u>4,877.5</u> <u>401.1</u>	<u>2,793.1</u> <u>232.0</u>	<u>486.1</u> <u>39.9</u>	<u>41,218.8</u> <u>3,409.6</u>	<u>53.4</u> <u>4.4</u>
<u>2015 with 2003 LRDP</u> <u>Vehicle Emissions</u>	<u>5,278.7</u>	<u>3,025.1</u>	<u>526.0</u>	<u>44,628.4</u>	<u>57.8</u>
<u>Increase due to 2003</u> <u>LRDP</u>	<u>401.2</u>	<u>232.0</u>	<u>39.9</u>	<u>3,409.6</u>	<u>4.4</u>
<u>Vehicular Emissions</u> <u>due to 2003 LRDP with</u> <u>Russell</u> <u>Connection</u> <u>2015 with</u> <u>2003 LRDP without the</u> <u>NMP Project</u>	<u>647.7</u> <u>5,439.7</u>	<u>333.3</u> <u>3,044.8</u>	<u>65.6</u> <u>544.1</u>	<u>5,149.1</u> <u>45,363.4</u>	<u>7.2</u> <u>59.7</u>

Note: Vehicle emission estimates include total vehicle emissions from trips within the City of Davis and UC Davis area, as well as emissions from vehicle trips made by UC Davis faculty, staff and students that would live in surrounding communities. Details of vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled are provided in Table 4.14-18 (Volume II) of this EIR.

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

The following stipulation of LRDP Mitigation 4.3-1(a), which includes a series of measures to reduce fugitive dust impacts associated with construction, was changed to increase its effectiveness. The impact of construction emissions associated with the LRDP remains significant and unavoidable.

- When materials are transported off-site, all material shall be covered, effectively wetted to limit visible dust emissions, or at least ~~six inches~~ two feet of freeboard space from the top of the container shall be maintained.

The following stipulation was added to LRDP Mitigation 4.3-1(b) to increase its effectiveness in reducing impacts of large construction project near receptors. The impact of construction emissions associated with the LRDP remains significant and unavoidable.

- Limit the area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activity at any one time.

DRAFT EIR SECTION 4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The following changes to Biological Resources, Section 4.4, of Volume I of the Draft EIR are the result of internal review and comments received on the Draft EIR. These changes do not alter the significance or the severity of any impact.

A footnote defining CDFG first and second category bird species of special concern was added to one of the criteria listed under, Standards of Significance, Section 4.4.2.1, as shown below:

- Result in a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status¹ species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)...

Footnote:

¹ Includes CDFG first and second category bird species of special concern. The third priority species are not included because, as stated in the CDFG list, they, "are not in any present danger of extirpation and their populations within most of their range do not appear to be declining seriously; however, simply by virtue of their small populations in California, they are vulnerable to extirpation should a threat materialize."

A referenced list of threatened and endangered species was updated in Analytical Method, Section 4.4.2.3.

- USFWS List of Endangered and Threatened Species that May Occur in or be Affected by Projects in the Selected Quads Listed Below (Saxon, Dixon, Allendale, Grays Bend, Davis, Woodland, Madison, Winters and Merritt). Reference File Number 1-1-03-SP-0717; Date: January 2, 2003, and as updated August 20, 2003.

Corrections have been made to some species names, habitat descriptions in Table 4.4-2, Potential Special Status Species within the Project Area. The grasshopper sparrow has been eliminated from the table as it was concluded that it does not occur in the project area. The changes in the table do not alter any analytical conclusion.

Volume IV

The text of LRDP Mitigation 4.4-2 was amended to include additional potential mitigation sites, and to increase mitigation acreage. These changes do not alter the significance or the severity of the impact.

LRDP ~~Impact Mitigation~~ 4.4-2: Development allowed under the 2003 LRDP would result in the conversion of approximately ~~650~~550 acres of Agricultural Land and Ruderal/Annual Grassland habitat to campus-related development which would result in the loss of general wildlife habitat for resident and migratory species, including foraging habitat for the Swainson's hawk.

Significance: Significant

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-2: The campus shall mitigate the loss of foraging habitat due to development through the establishment of ~~the 650-acre Russell Ranch Habitat Mitigation Area of mitigation lands~~ located within or near and next to the Putah Creek Riparian Reserve. Approximately 370 acres of this area shall be converted from existing agricultural uses to restored Valley-Foothill Riparian Woodland and Valley Grassland at Russell Ranch. An additional 280 acres of agricultural land will be protected with a habitat and farmland conservation mechanism either at the Russell Ranch or the Kidwell and McConeghy parcels. These grassland and agricultural lands would be available as foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk and other special-status species such as prairie falcon, golden eagle, wintering or migrating birds and birds of prey that may occasionally forage on campus lands. Restored Valley-Foothill Riparian Habitat would be available as nesting habitat for Swainson's hawk and other birds of prey.

An additional 15-acre mitigation area ~~shall~~would be established along the North Fork Cutoff. This area ~~shall~~would be restored as an oak-grassland and would be a nesting and foraging site for Swainson's hawk and other birds of prey.

Residual Significance: Less than significant

The mitigation acreage designated in LRDP Mitigation 4.4-3 for burrowing owls has been tripled to be consistent with mitigation guidelines developed by the California Burrowing Owl Consortium. Minor revisions in procedures for addressing burrowing owls also have been added to the mitigation. These changes do not affect the significance or the severity of the impact as assessed in the Draft EIR.

LRDP ~~Impact Mitigation~~ 4.4-3: Development allowed under the 2003 LRDP would result in the conversion of approximately 65 acres of Agricultural Land and Ruderal/Annual Grassland habitat suitable for nesting burrowing owls to campus-related development.

Significance: Potentially significant

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-3(a): The Russell Ranch Mitigation Area shall include at least ~~65~~195 acres of grassland habitat suitable for use by burrowing owls. Ground squirrels in the mitigation area shall not be subject to control measures and will be allowed to fluctuate in response to local conditions. Artificial burrows may be installed if ground squirrel populations are not providing a sufficient number of burrows to support burrowing owls.

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-3(b): The campus shall survey proposed development areas with potential habitat for the presence or absence of burrowing owls.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-3(c): The campus, ~~in consultation with the CDFG,~~ shall conduct a pre-construction survey of proposed project sites during the breeding season (from approximately February 1 through August 31), consistent with CDFG guidelines, in the same calendar year that construction is planned to begin. The survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if any burrowing owls are nesting on or directly adjacent to any proposed project site. If phased construction procedures are planned for the proposed project, the results of the above survey shall be valid only for the season when it is conducted.

If the pre-construction breeding season survey does not identify any nesting raptor species on the project site, then no further mitigation would be required. However, should any burrowing owls be found nesting on the project site, then LRDP Mitigation 4.4-3(d) shall be implemented.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-3(d): During the breeding season, the campus, consistent with CDFG guidelines~~in consultation with the CDFG,~~ shall not disturb an occupied burrow while there is an active nest and/or juvenile owls are present. Avoidance shall include the establishment of a non-disturbance buffer zone around the nest site consistent with CDFG guidelines. The buffer zone shall be delineated by highly visible temporary construction fencing. The occupied nest site shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to determine when the juvenile owl is fledged and independent. Disturbance of an occupied burrow shall only occur outside the breeding season and when there is no nest or juvenile owl based on monitoring by a qualified biologist.

Based on approval by CDFG, pre-construction and pre-breeding season exclusion measures may be implemented to preclude burrowing owl occupation of the project site prior to project-related disturbance. These include the following measures:

- Obviously inactive burrows in the project area will be closed. Active or potentially active ground squirrel burrows will be monitored to confirm use by ground squirrels and not by burrowing owls before ground squirrels are removed and the burrow is closed~~removal~~. One-way doors will be used on active burrows if use by ground squirrels cannot be confirmed.
- The owls will be displaced from the occupied burrows according to the CDFG burrowing owl guidelines. The owls will be displaced from their burrows by installing one-way exit doors in occupied or potential burrows within the area of disturbance. After 48 hours with the doors in place, the burrows will then be closed to prevent reoccupation by owls.
- Where feasible, artificial burrows will be provided in adjacent suitable habitat consistent with CDFG guidelines.

Residual Significance: Less than significant

Surveys conducted on the campus in the past 10 years indicated that lands within future development areas have supported 2-5 pairs of burrowing owls; 2-3 pairs in the Health Sciences District and 2 pairs on the west campus at the proposed location for the new neighborhood. The campus has managed the lands in and around in the Health Science District to discourage

establishment of new pairs. Without this management strategy, the number possibly could have been higher. Therefore, for purposes of this analysis it is assumed that the potential habitat of up to 10 pairs of burrowing owls could be affected by development proposed under the LRDP. The California Burrowing Owl Consortium, associated with the Santa Cruz Predatory Bird Research Group, has developed mitigation guidelines for burrowing owls. These guidelines state that each pair of burrowing owls requires 6.5 acres of foraging habitat. Thus, the potential loss of burrowing owl habitat is estimated to be approximately 65 acres. The guidelines recommend that three times the amount of affected habitat be included for off-site mitigation. Therefore, the mitigation area would be 195 acres. Potential impacts to nesting burrowing owls could result if the owls become established on a proposed project site. Pursuant to Section 3503.5 of the Fish and Game Code of California:

It is unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any birds in the orders Falconiformes or Strigiformes (birds-of-prey) or to take, possess, or destroy the nest or egg of any such bird except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation adopted pursuant thereto.

Direct take of an active raptor nest site would be in violation of Section 3503.5 and is, therefore, considered to be a potentially significant impact.

LRDP Impact and Mitigation 4.4-4 were revised to include reference to nesting raptors in general as well as Swainson's hawk. Under LRDP Mitigation 4.4-4(a), the discussion of "feasible changes" was expanded. Clarifications were added to the text of LRDP Mitigation 4.4-4(b), along with a list of qualifications for the biologist conducting the work. Stipulations also were added to strengthen nest-monitoring procedures. These changes do not affect the significance or the severity of the impact as assessed in the Draft EIR.

LRDP ~~Impact~~ Mitigation 4.4-4: Development allowed under the 2003 LRDP could result in the failure of nesting efforts by nesting raptors, including Swainson's hawks or other birds of prey.

Significance: Potentially significant

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-4(a): The campus shall conduct a pre-construction survey of trees on and adjacent to a project site during the raptor breeding season (approximately March 1 to August 31). Additionally, the campus shall conduct surveys within a ½-mile radius of the site to determine the presence or absence of any nesting Swainson's hawks. The surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist during the same calendar year that the proposed activity is planned to begin to determine if any nesting birds-of-prey would be affected. If phased construction procedures are planned for the proposed activity, the results of the above survey shall be valid only for the season when it is conducted.

If any Swainson's hawks are nesting within a one-half-mile radius of the project site or if other raptors are nesting in, on or adjacent to the project site, a qualified biologist shall determine the potential for disturbance to nesting raptors, including Swainson's hawks. If the biologist determines that there is a significant potential for disturbance, the campus shall implement feasible changes in the construction schedule or make other appropriate adjustments to the project in response to the specific circumstances. If feasible project changes are not readily identifiable, the campus will consult with CDFG to determine what actions should be taken to protect the nesting efforts.

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

If, after five years, a previously recorded nest site remains unoccupied by a Swainson's hawk, it will no longer be considered as a Swainson's hawk nest site subject to this mitigation.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-4(b): The campus shall continue to conduct annual surveys to determine the location of nesting Swainson's hawks and other birds of prey on the campus outside the Putah Creek corridor. If nesting Swainson's hawks are found during the survey at a previously unknown location within one-half mile of a project site and/or at a location closer to the project or more visually exposed to the project site than a nearby previously documented site, ~~not within 100 yards of a previously documented site,~~ a qualified biologist shall, prior to project construction, determine the potential for disturbance to nesting Swainson's hawks. If the biologist determines that there is a significant potential for disturbance, the campus shall implement feasible changes in the construction schedule or make other appropriate adjustments to the project in response to the specific circumstances (e.g. relocating noisy equipment or creating temporary sound barriers). ~~If, after five years, a previously recorded nest site remains unoccupied by a Swainson's hawk, it will no longer be considered as a Swainson's hawk nest site subject to this mitigation.~~

The implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.4-4(a) and (b) shall be conducted under the supervision of a biologist whose qualifications include:

- A bachelor's degree in biology or related field;
- Two years of field experience related to nesting raptors; and
- Prior construction monitoring experience.

Further:

- All decisions of the qualified biologist shall be made in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game.
- Monitoring shall be conducted for a sufficient time (minimum of 3 consecutive days following the initiation of construction) to verify that the nesting pair does not exhibit significant adverse reaction to construction activities (i.e., changes in behavioral patterns, reactions to construction noise, etc.); and
- Nest site monitoring will continue for a minimum of once a week through the nesting cycle at that nest.

The text of LRDP Impact 4.4-5 was amended for clarity.

LRDP ~~Impact Mitigation~~ 4.4-5: Development allowed under the 2003 LRDP would result in the loss of active nest sites~~trees~~ for Swainson's hawk.

The explanatory text for LRDP Impact 4.4-6 was also revised as shown below to clarify the nature of VELB occurrence on campus.

Surveys have been conducted for the presence of elderberry shrubs, the host plant species for the VELB, over a large portion of the campus including the major areas proposed for new development (Figure 4.4-2). Elderberry shrubs are known to occur in the Valley-Foothill Riparian

habitat along Putah Creek and at other locations on the campus. While elderberry shrubs may become established elsewhere as seeds are dispersed by birds and other means, this is not associated with their typical riparian habitat. Therefore, potential habitat for the VELB may be established in the future on project sites in the future that currently do not support any elderberry shrubs. No exit holes or VELB have been observed during any of the surveys on the urban and agricultural developed portion of campus and areas proposed for development under the 2003 LRDP.

Even though VELB has not been observed in any of the elderberry shrubs on the developed portion of campus, the USFWS considers all elderberry shrubs within the historic range of VELB as potential habitat for this federally-listed threatened species. Presently, destruction of elderberry stems greater than one inch in diameter is considered “take” under FESA and requires mitigation pursuant to USFWS guidelines. VELB exit holes on the stems of elderberry shrubs have been found on over 20 shrubs within or immediately adjacent to the Putah Creek Riparian Reserve on the main campus and the Russell Ranch (Sid England, personal communication with Teresa Talley and Lynn Kimsey, August 2003). Lands within the reserve are designated for Teaching and Research Open Space in the 2003 LRDP.

Implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.4-6(a) and (b) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

In the Draft EIR, LRDP Impact 4.4-9 erroneously had been called potentially significant before mitigation, although the text that follows indicates a less-than-significant impact. This was corrected in the Final EIR to indicate a less-than-significant impact before mitigation.

LRDP ~~Impact~~ Mitigation 4.4-9: Development of the 2003 LRDP would not~~could~~ interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish, or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

Significance: Less than~~Potentially~~ significant

Stipulations were added to LRDP Mitigation 4.4-10(b) to increase the effectiveness of the mitigation and improve monitoring procedures. These changes do not affect the significance or the severity of the impact as assessed in the Draft EIR.

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-10(b): If construction activities are to be conducted in the water during the migration season:

- Silt curtains will be used at the construction location.
- Water quality will be evaluated during and after all in-water construction activities. The performance criteria shall be no degradation of downstream water quality compared to upstream water quality. Water quality shall be evaluated by a qualified environmental monitor using appropriate qualitative or quantitative measurements. Remedial measures shall be implemented if downstream water quality is degraded. Remedial measures shall include the following:
 - Modification or suspension of in-water construction activities as appropriate;
 - Installation of additional sediment control devices; and
 - Additional monitoring to evaluate the water quality degradation and identify corrective measures.

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

- The University shall coordinate with the California Department of Fish and Game, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as appropriate to determine whether additional remedial measures are required.

Clarifications were added to LRDP Mitigation 4.4-11, as shown below.

LRDP Impact 4.4-11: Development under the 2003 LRDP could result in the removal of trees recognized to meet the campus' standards for important trees, including:

- a. *Heritage Trees:* Healthy valley oak trees with trunk diameters of 33 inches or greater at a height of 54 inches from the ground.
- b. *Specimen Trees:* Healthy trees or stands of trees that are of high value to the campus due to their size, species, extraordinary educational and research value, and/or other exceptional local importance.

Significance: Potentially significant

LRDP Mitigation 4.4-11: Before a project is approved under the 2003 LRDP, the campus will perform a tree survey of the project site. Grounds, the Office of Resource Management and Planning, and the Office of Architects and Engineers will provide input about tree classifications and will modify project design to avoid important trees if feasible. If a project cannot avoid an important tree, the following will apply:

- a. If a project would necessitate removal of a **Heritage Tree**, no mitigation would be available to fully mitigate the impact, and the impact would be significant and unavoidable. However, implementation of Mitigation 4.4-2 would restore Valley Foothill Riparian Woodland habitat at Russell Ranch, and plantings in this area would include valley oaks.
- b. If a project would necessitate removal of a **Specimen Tree**, the project would relocate the tree if feasible, or would replace the tree with the same species or species of comparable value (relocation or replacement should occur within the project area if feasible). This would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Residual Significance: a. Significant and unavoidable
b. Less than significant

Few, if any, Heritage Trees are likely to occur within areas planned for development under the 2003 LRDP, but Specimen Trees are likely to occur at various locations on campus. In accordance LRDP Mitigation 4.4-~~11~~11, campus departments (including Grounds, the Resource Management and Planning, and Architects and Engineers) would coordinate with each other to perform a tree survey, identify tree classifications, and modify project designs to avoid important trees if feasible. Relocation of Heritage Trees is considered infeasible because the chance of success is low. In addition, because of the age, rarity, and high local value associated with Heritage Trees, replacement of these trees is also not considered reasonable. Therefore, the impact of removing these trees is considered significant and unavoidable. However, implementation of LRDP Mitigation 4.4-2 would help to reduce this effect. If relocated or replaced as required in LRDP Mitigation 4.4-~~11~~11, removal of Specimen Trees would be considered a less-than-significant impact.

Volume IV

A reference was added to document the information cited regarding VELB occurrence on campus.

England, Sid. August 2003. Personal communication by Teresa Talley, UC Davis graduate student in Ecology and Lynn Kimsey, UC Davis Professor of Entomology, to Sid England, Office of Resource Management and Planning, regarding VELB findings on campus.

DRAFT EIR SECTION 4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The following changes to Section 4.5, Volume I of the Draft EIR (Cultural Resources), are the result of internal review and comments received on the Draft EIR.

Text regarding the results of a recently updated records search, and historic information provided by a commenter, was added to Section 4.5.1.2, Archaeological Inventory of the Campus, as shown below.

Historically, development of the project area was primarily agricultural, and settlement was quite sparse. The campus therefore would be expected to be less sensitive for the presence of historic archaeological resources. The ruins of a concrete reservoir, identified as the Briggs Well/Reservoir was documented and assessed in 1998, and was determined not eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (JRP 1998). No associated irrigation system or evidence of associated settlement were identified in archaeological surveys in the area (Pacific Legacy 1998). Although redeposited historic materials are found in fill along the South Fork of Putah Creek (Nadolski 2003a), no intact historic archaeological deposits or features have been identified on campus. Historic features previously documented on or immediately adjacent to the campus are noted in Section 4.5.1.3.

A list of known resources on campus also was added to the Final EIR, to provide the reader with more detailed information. This information does not change the impact conclusions presented in the Draft EIR.

The following archaeological sites on campus were identified from the summaries presented in the 1994 LRDP EIR (EIP Associates 1994), a recent summary of archaeology in the campus area (Nadolski 2003b), the results of an updated archaeological records search for the campus performed in 2003 (Shapiro 2003), and a report on an archaeological site on the campus, CA-SOL-397 (Shapiro and Tremaine et al. 1999).

- CA-YOL-134: a prehistoric archaeological deposit including a variety of artifacts as well as human remains, originally recorded in 1972 as a “burial site”;
- CA-SOL-397: prehistoric site with midden deposit, artifacts and human remains;
- CA-YOL-118: prehistoric site with midden deposits and burials;
- P-48-222: recently discovered prehistoric site with a range of artifacts and human remains;
- CA-SOL-271: prehistoric archaeological deposit in an off campus parcel examined under a LRDP alternative;
- Kidwell site: prehistoric site recently recorded in an off-campus parcel considered for a LRDP alternative;
- CA-YOL-146: prehistoric artifact scatter.

In addition, three possible site locations are noted in the campus vicinity; none of these has been confirmed through archaeological survey.

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

The following text was added to Section 4.5.1.3 to provide more detailed information regarding historic, architectural, and landscape resources on campus. This information does not change the impact analysis, mitigation procedures, or significance of severity of any of the impacts identified in the Draft EIR.

Records searches on campus and at the NWIC (Shapiro 2003) revealed the following previously recorded historic features:

- A segment of the Lincoln Highway that follows Russell Boulevard along the northern margin of the campus;
- The Avenue of Trees, a City of Davis Historic Landmark that consists of a double row of walnut trees along the Lincoln Highway;
- A portion of the Southern Pacific railroad between Davis and Cordelia, which runs along the margin of the campus;
- The Francis Russell Ranch historic complex, including a main house, three barns, a water tower, two sheds, gardens, a modern house and a chicken coop;
- The historic Gottfried Schmeiser residence (Russell Ranch area, adjacent to campus);
- A multiple listing of 48 old oak groves widely scattered throughout the county, one of which is associated with the Francis Russell Ranch.

The California Inventory of Historic Resources also lists Russell Boulevard between SR 113 and County Road 89 (presumably the same as the Lincoln Highway); the University House on the central campus, the Animal Science Building, and the Avenue of Trees (noted above).

Additional information on the Russell Boulevard Avenue of Trees and the historic Lincoln Highway was added to the text on page 4.5-9 in response to a number of comments.

There has not been a systematic inventory of campus structures such as bridges and water towers; however, these are subject to the same significance evaluation criteria as campus buildings, and may qualify as historic resources if they are 50 years of age or older. The historic Lincoln Highway and associated Avenue of Trees are listed as landmarks on the City of Davis Register of Historic Resources, as noted above. The Southern Pacific Railroad alignment adjacent to campus, also has been recorded as a cultural resource, as noted above.

The 1994 LRDP ~~also~~ included planning for the identification, assessment and treatment of significant historic landscape features on campus, such as the Quad on the central campus, and established rows of landscape trees along major roadway and at campus entrances. Examples include the historic “Avenue of Trees” along both sides of Russell Boulevard, and the Armstrong Walnut Grove in the area of the central campus’ South Entry. Trees and formal landscapes that may be of interest to the campus for aesthetic or biological reasons are addressed under Section 4.4 Biological Resources (Volume I). Historic plantings and other landscape features that contribute to the significance of historic architectural properties are addressed as cultural resources in conjunction with those properties.

An additional regulatory citation was added to Section 4.5.2.2, Archaeological Resources Standards of Significance (page 4.5-13). This does not change the regulatory context of the analysis in any way.

The 1994 LRDP EIR referenced CEQA Appendix K for standards of significance. The standards of resource significance, and for significance of impacts, are substantially the same as those applied in 1994, but have been supplanted by PRC § 5024.1, 14 CCR § 4850, which establishes the California Register of Historical Resources.

Volume IV

An additional regulatory citation was added to the text on page 4.5-13. This does not change the impact analysis, mitigation procedures, or the significance or severity of any impact.

Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines assigns special importance to human remains and specifies procedures to be used when Native American remains are discovered. These procedures are detailed under PRC § 5097.98. California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5(b) prohibits disturbance of human remains uncovered by excavation until the Coroner has made a finding relative to PRC 5097 procedures.

The same citation was added to LRDP Mitigation 4.5-4(c).

LRDP Mitigation 4.5-4(c): In the event of a discovery on campus of human bone, suspected human bone, or a burial, all excavation in the vicinity will halt immediately and the area of the find will be protected until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the bone is human. If the qualified archaeologist determines the bone is human, or if a qualified archaeologist is not present, the campus will notify the Yolo or Solano County Coroner (depending on the county of the find) of the find before additional disturbance occurs. Consistent with California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5(b), which prohibits disturbance of human remains uncovered by excavation until the Coroner has made a finding relative to PRC 5097 procedures, the campus will ensure that the remains and vicinity of the find are protected against further disturbance. If it is determined that the find is of Native American origin, the campus will comply with the provisions of PRC § 5097.98 regarding identification and involvement of the Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD).

DRAFT EIR SECTION 4.6 GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND SEISMICITY

The following change to Section 4.6, Volume I of the Draft EIR (Geology, Soils and Seismicity) is the result of internal review of the Draft EIR.

The text of LRDP Impact 4.6-2 was amended to clarify that the LRDP would not result in risks to life or property as the result of soils and seismic factors. This amendment does not alter the conclusion that the impact would be less than significant.

LRDP Impact 4.6-2: Development under the 2003 LRDP could occur on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and could result in on- or off-site lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, but would not create potential risks to life or property.

DRAFT EIR SECTION 4.7 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The following changes to Section 4.7, Volume I of the Draft EIR (Hazards and Hazardous Materials), are the result of internal review and comments received on the Draft EIR.

The following introductory information is updated:

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

In response to the Notice of Preparation (see Appendix A), the following concerns were raised by commenters regarding hazards and hazardous materials: the need for evaluation of project sites for possible contamination resulting from past land uses; potential harm to children at Fairfield school and nearby residents from pesticides used by farmers leasing land at the Russell Ranch; and potential health and safety risks from the proposed National Biocontainment Laboratory (NBL). On September 30, 2003, the campus learned that it was not a recipient of a grant to construct an NBL. Therefore, no additional environmental review of this facility is required. These remaining issues are addressed below.

Section 4.7.1.1, Hazardous Materials at UC Davis was amended to include additional information about the LEHR site.

The California Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) recently completed a public health assessment for the LEHR site (California Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry 2003). The ATSDR concluded that nitrates and metals in private wells in the area constitute a public health hazard; however, these contaminants are not believed to be related to the LEHR site. Although there is a potential for exposure to low concentrations of chemical and radioactive contamination to those who swim or fish in Putah Creek, the contaminants were detected infrequently and the exposures were determined to be not harmful. The ATSDR determined that there was a public health hazard associated with elevated levels of mercury in largemouth bass from Putah Creek near the LEHR site, but comparable levels of mercury were detected throughout the area. No other current or future public health hazards associated with LEHR site contamination were identified.

The text of LRDP Mitigations 4.7-8 and 4.7-10 was amended to clarify the nature of the impact. These changes do not affect the significance or the severity of the impact as assessed in the Draft EIR.

LRDP Impact 4.7-8: Implementation of the 2003 LRDP ~~could~~would increase the routine transport of hazardous materials to and from campus, which would not significantly increase hazards to the public or the environment.

LRDP Impact 4.7-10: Implementation of the 2003 LRDP ~~could~~would increase use of hazardous materials by non-UC entities on campus, which could create hazards to the public or the environment under routine and upset conditions.

The text of LRDP Mitigation 4.7-10 was amended to clarify the implementation procedure. These changes do not affect the significance or the severity of the impact as assessed in the Draft EIR.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-10: For projects proposed by non-UC entities on campus that involve laboratory space, non-UC entities shall be required, through contracts and agreements, to implement programs and controls that provide the same level of protection required of campus laboratories and departments. ~~Non-UC entities shall provide to campus EH&S copies of all required environmental reports to local, state, and federal environmental and safety regulations.~~ The following project-specific mitigation measures would be implemented for non-UCD tenants:

(i) Non-UC entities shall submit the qualifications of designated laboratory directors to UC Davis EH&S Office prior to commencing

laboratory operations. Such documentation shall be in the form of educational and professional qualifications/_experience.

- ~~(ii)~~ii) Non-UC entities shall submit certification of compliance with NIH biosafety principles to the UC Davis EH&S Office prior to commencing on-site research or pilot plant manufacturing activities. Non-UC entities shall submit copies of completed medical waste management plans, biosafety management plans, inventories of infectious or genetically modified agents, applicable permits and updates.
- ~~(iii)~~iii) If hazardous material quantities are proposed to be increased above applicable threshold quantities as defined in California Code of Regulations, Title 19, Division 2, Chapter 4.5, non-UC entities shall implement a Risk Management Plan/California Accidental Release Prevention Plan (RMP/Cal-ARP), which discusses the handling and storage of acutely hazardous materials on site. The RMP/Cal-ARP shall be approved by the CUPA and filed with the UC Davis EH&S Office prior to commencing proposed operations.
- iv) Non-UC entities shall submit certification to the UC Davis EH&S to verify that applicable requirements for handling and disposal of hazardous wastes have been met prior to commencing on-site research or pilot plant manufacturing activities. Non-UC entities shall submit copies of management plans for handling and disposal of hazardous wastes, and written verification of contracts with licensed waste disposal firms.
- v) Non-UC entities shall provide to campus EH&S copies of all required environmental reports to local, state, and federal environmental and safety regulators.

The explanatory text following LRDP Impact 4.7-14 was expanded to provide further explanation why construction in the vicinity of the LEHR site would not pose a significant hazard.

The California Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) recently completed a public health assessment for the LEHR site (California Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry 2003). The ATSDR concluded that nitrates and metals in private wells in the area constitute a public health hazard; however, these contaminants are not believed to be related to the LEHR site. Although there is a potential for exposure to low concentrations of chemical and radioactive contamination to those who swim or fish in Putah Creek, the contaminants were detected infrequently and the exposures are not harmful. The ATSDR determined that there was a public health hazard associated with elevated levels of mercury in largemouth bass from Putah Creek near the LEHR site, but comparable levels of mercury were detected throughout the area. No other current or future public health hazards associated with LEHR site contamination were identified.

The text of LRDP Mitigation 4.7-15 was amended to recognize a potential hazard to aircraft. In addition, LRDP Mitigations 4.7-15(b) and (c) are added to the measure. As discussed in the text following the mitigations, these changes do not affect the significance or the severity of the impact, and the impact is less than significant after mitigation.

LRDP Impact 4.7-15: Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would include campus development within 2 miles of public use airports, which could result in safety hazards for people residing or working in the area,

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

and would include lighting on recreation fields that could result in a hazard for aircraft.

Significance: Potentially significant

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-15(a): The UC Davis Airport flight pattern for Runway 16 shall be changed to a right-hand approach to minimize overflight of living and working areas.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-15(b): Lighting for recreation fields in the NMP will be tested by night flights, and adjusted as necessary to eliminate glare that could pose a hazard for aircraft.

LRDP Mitigation 4.7-15(c): UC Davis or a developer acting on behalf of UC Davis shall include disclosure statements in marketing and sales materials for the NMP informing potential owners of property in the NMP of the presence of the University Airport.

Residual Significance: Less than significant

As shown on Figure 4.7-2, the existing aircraft flight pattern for the UC Davis Airport includes separate flight tracks, allowing approaches from the north or the south, depending on the direction of the wind. Most commonly, winds at the airport are from the south and aircraft approach the airport from the east, enter the counter-clockwise flight track and make a left-hand turn at the north end of the airport to approach the runway from the north (a left-hand approach). When the wind is from the north, aircraft approach the airport from the west, making a left turn at the south end of the airport to approach the runway from the south.

The Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for the counties of Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba, published an Airport Land Use Commission Policy Plan for the UC Davis Airport in 1992. The plan places restrictions on certain areas in the vicinity of the airport to minimize the number of people exposed to aircraft crash hazards. However, the ALUC has not published a land use compatibility plan for the UC Davis Airport. Since 1994, Section 21096 of the California Public Resources Code has required that Caltrans' *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook* (2002) be utilized by lead agencies preparing environmental impact reports for projects situated within an airport influence area as defined in an ALUC compatibility plan, or, if a compatibility plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public-use airport.

Night lighting on recreation fields and other campus facilities, particularly in the NMP, could result in upward glare, which could pose a hazard for aircraft in the vicinity of University Airport. The campus will implement LRDP Mitigation 4.7-15(b) to ensure that lighting is appropriately directed, and will check lighting from the air after new lighting is installed to ensure that there is no upward glare that would pose an aircraft hazard.

OTHER SECTIONS IN VOLUME I

No substantive changes were made to text, tables, or analysis in Section 4.0, Volume I, Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation.

3.2 CHANGES TO VOLUME II

DRAFT EIR SECTION 4.9 LAND USE AND PLANNING

The following changes to Section 4.9, Volume II of the Draft EIR (Land Use and Planning) are the result of internal review and comments received on the Draft EIR.

Volume IV

The text in Section 4.9.1.3, Planned/Proposed Land Use Changes in the Project Vicinity, was revised to clarify the nature of previous consideration of the Nishi parcel.

Current land use proposals in the vicinity of campus-owned land are limited to initial discussions between the City of Davis and a development option held by a private developer, who commissioned a traffic study seeking approval for residential land uses south of the central campus on approximately 35 acres of land known as the Nishi property. There were traffic constraints upon the development of this property.

DRAFT EIR SECTION 4.10 NOISE

The following changes to Section 4.10, Volume II of the Draft EIR (Noise) are the result of internal review and comments received on the Draft EIR. These changes do not affect the significance or the severity of the impacts as assessed in the Draft EIR.

LRDP Impact 4.10-2 has been revised to indicate that the impact would occur at only a few locations, and also to delete analysis previously reported for traffic noise impacts associated with the variants of the 2003 LRDP that included an NMP vehicular connection to Russell Boulevard. The Draft EIR erroneously reported noise impacts at a number of locations. This error was due to an inaccurate application of the significance criteria. Corrections have been made to the impact discussion to reflect this. Table 4.10-4, as revised, is included here in its entirety to indicate the changes that resulted from the additional examination of impacts reported in the Draft EIR.

In addition, LRDP Mitigations 4.10-2 (a through d) were reorganized into Mitigations (a) and (b). Text was added to explain the campus' fair share contribution to the City of Davis' noise abatement program for Russell Boulevard. Previous mitigation (c) was eliminated as it addressed noise impacts at a location on campus that had been erroneously identified on the basis of an incorrect application of noise significance criteria. No impact would occur at this location.

LRDP Impact 4.10-2: Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would result in increased vehicular traffic on the regional road network, which would substantially increase ambient noise levels at some locations.

Significance: Significant

LRDP Mitigation 4.10-2(a): For noise-sensitive uses adjacent to Russell Boulevard between Arlington Boulevard and Arthur Street, the existing soundwall (approximately 6.5 feet in height) could be increased slightly in height and extended to include the daycare center to the east.

For noise-sensitive uses adjacent to Russell Boulevard between Arthur Street and SR 113, and from SR 113 to La Rue/Anderson Road and from La Rue Road to Oak Street, soundwalls may be constructed for exterior residential and recreational land uses within approximately 100 feet of the centerline of Russell Boulevard, where construction of such walls would not interfere with driveway access.

~~**LRDP Mitigation 4.10-2(b):** For noise sensitive uses adjacent to Russell Boulevard between Arthur Street and SR 113, and from SR 113 to La Rue/Anderson Road and from La Rue Road to Oak Street, soundwalls may be constructed for exterior residential and recreational land uses within approximately 100 feet of the~~

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

~~centerline of Russell Boulevard, where construction of such walls would not interfere with driveway access. The campus shall reimburse the City of Davis the campus' fair share of the cost of a City of Davis' noise abatement program for reducing interior noise levels in homes along Russell Boulevard that are significantly affected by noise from 2003 LRDP-related traffic growth. The campus' contribution to the City's noise abatement program could be used to extend sound walls as described above or for other noise abatement measures such as retrofit of homes. The campus' fair share shall be determined based on the volume of traffic added to Russell Boulevard by the campus as a result of 2003 LRDP implementation and the percentage that 2003 LRDP-related traffic increases constitute of the average daily traffic on the roadway.~~

LRDP Mitigation 4.10-2(c): ~~For noise sensitive uses adjacent to La Rue Road between Hutchison Drive and Russell Boulevard, soundwalls may be constructed for exterior residential and recreational land uses within approximately 100 feet of the centerline of Russell Boulevard, where construction of such walls would not interfere with driveway access.~~

LRDP Mitigation 4.10-2(bd): For components of the 2003 LRDP having future noise-sensitive land uses such as the Neighborhood and Research Park, building and area layouts ~~shall~~ incorporate noise control as a design feature; including increased setbacks, landscaped berms, and using building placement to shield noise-sensitive exterior areas from direct roadway views.

Residual Significance: Significant and unavoidable

As previously discussed, the noise prediction model (S32) was used to estimate the future community noise levels from traffic associated with existing conditions, the No Project conditions, and ~~with~~ under 2003 LRDP variations conditions. Based on the traffic noise model output for the peak-noise-hour a CNEL value was calculated. Similar to the locations where ambient noise was measured during the survey, the selected modeling locations are representative of an area and portion of the community that might experience project-related traffic noise increases. Sixteen different locations were evaluated using 30 modeled sites. The identity, geographical distribution, and grouping of modeled sites are shown on Figure 4.10-3, Noise Modeling Locations. The information provided by this modeling, along with the results from the ambient noise survey measurements, was compared to the noise impact significance criteria. This was done to assess whether and where traffic noise might cause a significant impact ~~and the relative degree of impact among the alternatives being evaluated~~. The comparisons are presented in Table 4.10-4, LRDP Traffic Noise Impact Analysis Results.

A significant noise impact would result if project-related noise causes the criterion level to be exceeded compared to the existing conditions. For locations that would be above the criterion level without the project under existing conditions, a significant impact would occur if the project resulted in a substantial increase (as defined in Table 4.10-3).

For example, for the area within 100 feet from the centerline of Russell Boulevard, east of La Rue Road/Anderson Road and Oak Avenue, based on measurements of the existing noise environment, the existing CNEL is calculated to be 63 dBA. For the No Project conditions (2015 with no 2003 LRDP), the calculated environmental noise level is 64 dBA CNEL. At this noise level, the area would not be considered noise-impacted because the CNEL is less than the criterion level. For the same area, the predicted noise level for the future year plus the traffic from the 2003 LRDP is 65 dBA CNEL. This is at the criterion level of 65 dBA but does not exceed it.

Furthermore, the increase in noise with the project does not represent a “substantial increase” because it is only 2 dBA ~~above existing ambient level~~. ~~Noise levels at or above the criterion level would result in a significant noise impact based on the criteria presented in Table 4.10-3.~~ The

~~effect of future year traffic plus 2003 LRDP without the NMP connection to Russell Boulevard is 65 dBA CNEL. This variant also would not cause a noise impact because the level is at the impact criterion and there would not be a substantial increase in noise levels above ambient levels.~~

To summarize for this general location, expected growth in traffic volume from the existing condition to the future-without-the-project condition would result in a slight but imperceptible noise increase. (Refer to Section 4.10.1.1 Fundamentals of Environmental Noise for discussion of perception of change in noise level.) ~~With the 2003 LRDP, future traffic noise levels would be 2 decibels higher than existing levels with either the 2003 LRDP, or the 2003 LRDP without the NMP Russell Boulevard variation.~~ The impact at this location would be less than significant. The data from Table 4.10-4 were used in the same manner described above to evaluate traffic noise effects on other areas.

~~On an overall basis, five areas are currently considered noise impacted because the criterion level for traffic noise is exceeded for noise sensitive land uses. Under the No Project conditions, these same five areas would be considered impacted due to continuing exceedance of the criterion level for noise sensitive land uses with no substantial increase in traffic noise. With the implementation of the 2003 LRDP (with an NMP connection at Russell Boulevard), a total of 14 areas would be significantly affected by additional traffic to the campus. At all of these locations (Modeled Receiver Number 1, 7, 10, 13, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30), noise levels with traffic from the campus in conjunction with background traffic would exceed the criterion level of 65 dBA CNEL. At none of these locations, would there be a substantial increase in noise over existing conditions. In the event that a connection to Russell Boulevard from the NMP is not provided, at one location (Modeled Receiver Number 26 on Hutchison Drive) the noise levels would be lower and the impact would be avoided. In general, the two LRDP variants have relatively small differences with respect to actual decibel differences and numbers of areas impacted. Both project variants would cause moderately greater traffic noise impact than the No Project Alternative as shown in Table 4.10-4, significant noise impacts would result at one location off-campus and two locations on-campus from the implementation of the 2003 LRDP. At Modeled Receiver Number 1 (which is on Russell Boulevard, just west of Arlington), the project-related traffic would increase noise levels from 65 dBA CNEL under existing conditions to 68 dBA CNEL under LRDP conditions, and thereby cause the criterion level to be exceeded. At Modeled Receiver 10 (which is on the NMP site adjacent to SR 113), noise levels would increase from 65 dBA CNEL under existing conditions to 66 dBA CNEL under the 2003 LRDP, which would cause an exceedance of the criterion level, and this would represent a significant impact. At Modeled Receiver 13 (which is on campus on Hutchison Drive, west of SR-113), with the implementation of the LRDP, noise levels would increase from 62 dBA CNEL under existing conditions to 69 dBA CNEL. This would represent both a substantial increase in noise and an exceedance of the criterion level. Therefore, the impact at this location would be significant. Note that there are no sensitive receptors currently at either of these two locations.~~

~~On an overall basis, five areas are currently considered noise impacted because the criterion level for traffic noise is exceeded for noise sensitive land uses. Under the No Project conditions, these same five areas would be considered impacted due to continuing exceedance of the criterion level for noise sensitive land uses with no substantial increase in traffic noise. With the implementation of the 2003 LRDP (with an NMP connection at Russell Boulevard), a total of 14 areas would be significantly affected by additional traffic to the campus. At all of these locations (Modeled Receiver Number 1, 7, 10, 13, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30), noise levels with traffic from the campus in conjunction with background traffic would exceed the criterion level of 65 dBA CNEL. At none of these locations, would there be a substantial increase in noise over existing conditions. In the event that a connection to Russell Boulevard from the NMP is not provided, at one location (Modeled Receiver Number 26 on Hutchison Drive) the noise levels would be lower and the impact would be avoided. In general, the two LRDP variants have relatively small differences with respect to actual decibel differences and numbers of areas impacted. Both project variants The 2003 LRDP would cause moderately greater traffic noise impact than the No Project Alternative.~~

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

LRDP Mitigations 4.10-2(a and b-d) are recommended to address project impacts. It should be noted that these noise impacts are predicted based on traffic volumes associated with full development under the 2003 LRDP. In the interim years, because the traffic volumes would be lower, some of these impacts would not occur, and the recommended mitigation measures may not be necessary. Apart from the three locations described above where there would be significant noise impacts, there are other locations on-and off-campus that would not experience significant noise impacts but noise levels would reach 65 dBA CNEL. Mitigation to reduce noise at these locations is also included under LRDP Mitigation 4.10-2.

~~The installation of sound walls on property not owned by the University of California would not be a feasible mitigation measure for the University of California to implement. Sound wall installation is identified as a potential mitigation measure that could be completed by the City of Davis or by property owners. Because of potential negative visual impacts and a lack of sound wall funding, this mitigation measure is not realistic. Accordingly, the impact is identified as significant and unavoidable.~~

The campus cannot ensure that LRDP Mitigation 4.10-2(a and b) would be implemented by the City. Furthermore, it is uncertain whether the City's noise abatement program will reduce both indoor and outdoor noise levels to levels considered acceptable, so even after mitigation, the impact would still be considered significant and unavoidable.

Table 4.10-4
LRDP Traffic Noise Impact Analysis Results

Modeled Receiver Number	Representative Area	Calculated Existing CNEL (dBA)	2015, No Project				2015 plus 2003 LRDP with NMP Russell Boulevard Connection				2015 plus 2003 LRDP without NMP Russell Boulevard Connection			
			Calculated CNEL (dBA)	Change compared with Existing (dB(A))	Does it exceed the because <u>exceedence of the</u> criterion level?	Would there be a substantial increase?	Calculated CNEL (dBA)	Change compared with Existing (dB(A))	Does it exceed the criterion level?	Would there be a substantial increase?	Calculated CNEL (dBA)	Change compared with Existing (dB(A))	Does it exceed the criterion level?	Would there be a substantial increase?
1	50 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, west of Arlington Boulevard.	65	66	1	Yes	No	67	2	Yes	No	68	3	Yes	Yes
2	100 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, west of Arlington Boulevard.	59	60	1	No	No	61	2	No	No	62	3	No	No
3	200 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, west of Arlington Boulevard.	56	57	1	No	No	58	2	No	No	58	2	No	No
4	50 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, between Arlington Boulevard and Arthur Street, behind existing soundwall.	60	61	1	No	No	61	1	No	No	61	1	No	No
5	100 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, between Arlington Boulevard and Arthur Street, behind existing soundwall.	57	58	1	No	No	59	2	No	No	58	1	No	No
6	200 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, between Arlington Boulevard and Arthur Street, behind existing soundwall.	56	56	0	No	No	57	1	No	No	57	1	No	No
7	50 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, between Arthur Street and La Rue/Anderson Road.	70	71	1	YesNo	No	72	2	Yes	No	72	2	YesNo	No
8	100 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, between Arthur Street and La Rue/Anderson Road.	62	63	1	No	No	64	2	No	No	64	2	No	No
9	200 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, between Arthur Street and La Rue/Anderson Road.	61	61	0	No	No	62	1	No	No	62	1	No	No
10	50 feet from Top-Of-Slope (TOS), west of SR-113, south of Russell Boulevard.	65	66	1	YesNo	n/a	66	1	Yes	n/a	66	1	Yes	n/a
11	100 feet from TOS, west of SR-113, south of Russell Boulevard.	62	63	1	No	n/a	63	1	No	n/a	63	1	No	n/a
12	200 feet from TOS, west of SR-113, south of Russell Boulevard.	60	60	0	No	n/a	60	0	No	n/a	60	0	No	n/a
13	50 feet from centerline of Hutchison Drive, west of SR-113.	62	63	1	No	n/a	68	6	Yes	n/a	69	7	Yes	n/a
14	50 feet from NMP Main Project Access Road, north of Hutchison Drive.	52	53	1	No	n/a	55	3	No	n/a	56	4	No	n/a
15	50 feet from NMP Main Project Access Road, south of Russell Boulevard.	57	58	1	No	n/a	58	1	No	n/a	58	1	No	n/a
16	100 feet from centerline of La Rue Road, north of Hutchison Drive.	66	67	1	YesNo	No	68	2	Yes	No	68	2	YesNo	No
17	100 feet from centerline of La Rue Road, south of Hutchison Drive.	63	64	1	No	n/a	64	1	No	n/a	64	1	No	n/a
18	50 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, east of La Rue/Anderson Road.	71	72	1	YesNo	No	72	1	Yes	No	72	1	YesNo	No
19	100 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, east of La	63	64	1	No	No	65	2	Yes	No	65	2	YesNo	No

Table 4.10-4
LRDP Traffic Noise Impact Analysis Results

Modeled Receiver Number	Representative Area	Calculated Existing CNEL (dBA)	2015, No Project				2015 plus 2003 LRDP with NMP Russell Boulevard Connection				2015 plus 2003 LRDP without NMP Russell Boulevard Connection			
			Calculated CNEL (dBA)	Change compared with Existing (dB(A))	Does it exceed the cause the exceedance of the criterion level?	Would there be a substantial increase?	Calculated CNEL (dBA)	Change compared with Existing (dB(A))	Does it exceed the criterion level?	Would there be a substantial increase?	Calculated CNEL (dBA)	Change compared with Existing (dB(A))	Does it exceed the criterion level?	Would there be a substantial increase?
	Rue/Anderson Road.													
20	200 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, east of La Rue/Anderson Road.	62	62	0	No	No	63	1	No	No	63	1	No	No
21	100 feet from centerline of Old Davis Road, north of I-80.	64	65	1	Yes/No	n/a	65	1	Yes	n/a	65	1	Yes/No	n/a
22	85 feet from centerline of B Street.	60	61	1	No	No	61	1	No	No	61	1	No	No
23	50 feet from TOS, west of SR-113, north of Hutchison Drive.	65	65	0	Yes/No	n/a	65	0	Yes	n/a	65	0	Yes/No	n/a
24	100 feet from TOS, west of SR-113, north of Hutchison Drive.	62	62	0	No	n/a	62	1	No	n/a	62	0	No	n/a
25	200 feet from TOS, west of SR-113, north of Hutchison Drive.	58	59	1	No	n/a	59	1	No	n/a	59	1	No	n/a
26	75 feet from Hutchison Drive between SR-113 and La Rue Road.	64	64	0	No	No	65	1	Yes	No	64	0	No	No
27	100 feet from centerline of I-80.	69	70	1	Yes/No	n/a	70	1	Yes	n/a	70	1	Yes/No	n/a
28	200 feet from centerline of I-80.	68	69	1	Yes/No	n/a	69	1	Yes	n/a	69	1	Yes/No	n/a
29	400 feet from centerline of I-80.	66	67	1	Yes/No	n/a	67	1	Yes	n/a	67	1	Yes/No	n/a
30	100 feet from centerline of Richards Boulevard.	66	67	1	Yes/No	No	68	2	Yes	No	68	2	Yes/No	No

Note: n/a - not applicable because there are no existing noise sensitive uses at this site.
Shaded cells indicate potentially significant impacts.

DRAFT EIR SECTION 4.11 POPULATION AND HOUSING

The following changes to Section 4.11, Volume II of the Draft EIR (Population and Housing), are the result of internal review and comments received on the Draft EIR.

Table 4.11-4, Section 4.11.1.2 has been amended as shown below to correct a typographical error and minor mathematical errors, and to clarify the information presented. These changes do not affect the significance or the severity of the impact as assessed in the Draft EIR.

**Table 4.11-4
Assumptions for City of Davis Housing and Population 2002-2015**

	Dwelling Units	Dwelling Unit Sources and Notes	Population	Population Sources and Notes
Existing (2002)	24,511	Provided by City of Davis Planning Division. Accounts for building permits issued through 2002.	63,300	Population estimate for City of Davis (incorporated area) from Table E-1, State of California, DOF.
2010 General Plan	25,816	City of Davis March 2003 Revised 2010 General Dwelling Unit Maximum provided by City of Davis Planning Division, Bob Wolcott.	64,000	Growth management target population identified on Page 88 of City of Davis General Plan for the year 2010.
Growth 2002 to 2010	305 <u>1,305</u>	Difference between 2010 General Plan and Existing (2002).	700	Difference between Existing (2002) and 2010 General Plan
2015 Projected	28,225	2010 General Plan multiplied by compounded 1.8 percent which was the dwelling unit growth rate assumed in the City of Davis/UC Davis Water Study. ¹	72,454 <u>72,510</u>	Sum of 2010 General Plan and Growth 2010-2002 <u>2002-2010</u> to 2015.
Growth 2010 to 2015	3,409	Difference between 2015 Projected and 2010 General Plan	8,454	Dwelling unit growth 2010 to 2015 multiplied by 2.48 people per household. 2.48 obtained from SACOG indicator ratio of people per household in City of Davis for years 2000 to 2015.
Total Growth 2002 to 2015	3,714	Difference between 2015 Projected and Existing (2002)	9,154 <u>9,210</u>	Difference between 2015 Projected and Existing (2002) ²

¹Alternatively, assuming on additional 250 units per year above the 2010 General Plan beginning in approximately 2005 or 2006 as is currently being considered by the Davis City Council project to approximately 28,066–28,316 units in 2015.

²2002–2015 population growth increment based on 2.5 people per household per 2010 City of Davis General Plan projection and SACOG City of Davis ratios of people/household.

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

Section 4.11.2.3, Analytical Method, has been amended to explain the bases for assumptions about residence in Davis.

Because of the uncertainty associated with provision of new housing in Davis, the current percentage of employees that live in the community was not used to estimate the number of new employees likely to reside in the City of Davis. Instead, as explained earlier, it was assumed that about 26 percent of the new housing units in Davis would be occupied by LRDP-related employees, that is, approximately 970 employees would likely live in Davis. The estimate of 26 percent of future housing units in the City of Davis being occupied by a UC Davis affiliated employee is calculated from the existing ratio of UC Davis employees to housing units in the City of Davis. With respect to the remaining employees, the numbers of persons likely to reside in other communities were developed based on weighted percentages, with weights derived from the travel survey data.

DRAFT EIR SECTION 4.12 PUBLIC SERVICES

Section 4.12.1.2, Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services, has been revised to show corrected data on the domestic/fire water system.

Peak hour capacity of the campus' domestic/fire water system in 2000 (including wells, storage, and booster pumping) was estimated at approximately 9,000 gpm. With the recent addition of a new water tank, the system's capacity has increased since 2000, and as of summer 2003 the system's capacity is approximately 10,130 gpm (Philips 2003d). ~~Recent peak hour capacity of the campus' domestic/fire water system (including wells, storage, and booster pumping) was estimated at approximately 10,890 gpm.~~ Additional information on the domestic/fire water system is included in Section 4.15 Utilities (Volume II).

Section 4.12.1.3, Schools, including data in Table 4.12-2, has been revised with new data provided by the Davis Joint Unified School District (DJUSD). These revisions do affect the severity or significance of school impacts.

The DJUSD estimates student enrollment based on a rate of 0.69 student per single-family residential unit and 0.44 student per multi-family residential unit. At these rates, student enrollment under the current City General Plan would be over 10,500 by 2010 (Jones & Stokes 2000). Capacity of the school district, not including portable units, is approximately 8,272. ~~The new Marguerite Montgomery Elementary School was not yet operating at capacity (capacity is 581 students) in 1999-2000.~~ In addition, the DJUSD is currently building a new 800-student junior high school that is projected to be complete in the summer of 2004. This would bring capacity of the school district up to ~~10,127~~ 9,072 (DJUSD 2003). The DJUSD's current Ten-Year Facilities Master Plan, which extends through 2009-10, identifies the need for an additional elementary school located in the Mace Ranch area and expansion of the existing Davis Senior High School (DJUSD 2002). The campus and the DJUSD have been coordinating throughout the planning process for the NMP regarding its school facilities.

Table 4.12-2
Existing Enrollment and Capacity in the Davis Joint Unified School District

School	Capacity ^a	Enrollment ^b
Elementary Schools		
Birch Lane, K-6	716 <u>581</u>	740
Cesar Chavez, K-6	621 <u>581</u>	572
Fairfield, K-3	58 <u>60</u>	59

**Table 4.12-2
Existing Enrollment and Capacity in the Davis Joint Unified School District**

School	Capacity ^a	Enrollment ^b
Marguerite Montgomery, K-1	407 ^c 581	107
North Davis, K-6	605 581	573
Patwin, K-6	605 581	520
Pioneer, K-6	734 581	734
Valley Oak, K-6	681 581	646
Robert E. Willett, K-6	621 581	615
Davis School for Independent Study, K-6	36	36
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>4,784</i> 4,708*	<i>4,602</i> 4,566
Junior High Schools		
Emerson, 7-9	1,005 800	980
Holmes, 7-9	1,062 800	1,066
Davis School for Independent Study, 7-9	44	44
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>2,111</i> 6001,600	<i>2,090</i> 2,046
High Schools		
Davis, 10-12	1,900 1,800	1,899
King (continuation), 10-12	68 70	72
Davis School for Independent Study, 10-12	94	94
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>2,064</i> 1,964	2,065
Total	<u>8,272</u>	<u>8,757</u>8,677^d

^a Jones & Stokes 2000 (1999-2000 Capacity) and DJUSD 2002 (Independent Study 2001-02 capacity)-DJUSD 2003. Does not include capacity in portable units.

^b DJUSD 2001 (October 2001 Enrollment) and DJUSD 2002 (Independent Study 2001-02 enrollment)2003.

^c Assumes capacity after construction sufficient capacity for 2001-02 enrollment. ~~Montgomery Elementary opened only kindergarten and 1st grade classes in 2001-02. Capacity after construction and at full operation could accommodate 581 students. (anticipated to be complete in 2004-05). Montgomery~~ Montgomery Elementary opened only K and 1st classes in 2001-02.

^d ~~Assumes sufficient capacity for 2001-02 enrollment.~~

The following language was added to Section 4.12.2.3, Analytical Method, to update information about "fair share":

It should be noted that because of City of Marina versus California State University lawsuit that is currently pending decision in the California Supreme Court, there is uncertainty regarding whether the University can in fact make fair share contributions for certain improvements that are not within the jurisdiction of the University. Therefore, this fair share measure may be modified in response to the ultimate decision in that case.

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

Population numbers used in error in the discussion of impacts on the UC Davis Police Department under LRDP Impact 4.12-1 have been corrected. These changes do not affect the significance or the severity of the impact.

If the campus Police Department provides service to the NMP, which includes an additional ~~2,080~~3,170 people (including 850 dependents of UC affiliates, 190 employees, and ~~1,040~~2,130 CEC students), ~~two~~3.2 additional officers (for a total of ~~51.5~~52.7) would be needed to meet the desired level of service.

If the City of Davis Police Department serves the approximately ~~5,580~~ people in the proposed Neighborhood (with approximately ~~4,350~~ residents, 190 employees, and ~~1,040~~ CEC students) 4,350 residents in the Neighborhood, the department would need to hire approximately ~~7.3~~4.4 additional police officers to adequately serve this area.

The discussion text under LRDP Impact 4.12-4, and data in Table 4.12-4 in the same section have been revised with refined data received from the DJUSD during the comment period (Comment Letter LA-3) and other sources. These changes do not affect the significance or the severity of the impact as assessed in the Draft EIR.

The Neighborhood would also include a Community Education Center (CEC) that would accommodate a DJUSD High School satellite program with a capacity for ~~80 to 200~~ up to 250 students. This program would offset the demand for DJUSD high school facilities associated with the Neighborhood's approximately 77 high school students and it would provide additional capacity to compensate for the NMPs demand on DJUSD's junior high facilities in the City of Davis.

**Table 4.12-4
DJUSD Capacity and Enrollment with NMP
(not including portable units)**

School Type	Year Completed	Capacity	2001-02 Baseline Enrollments with NMP Students ^c
Elementary Schools			
Existing Baseline Elementary Schools	Existing 2004-05	5,258 a ^b <u>4,708</u>	<u>4,780</u> <u>4,744</u>
NMP Elementary School	By 2015-16	200 ^e	
<i>Elementary Subtotal</i>		5,458 <u>4,908</u>	
Junior High Schools			
Existing Baseline Junior High Schools	Existing	2,111 <u>1,600</u> ^a	<u>2,170</u> <u>2,126</u>
Junior High under construction	2004-05	800 ^b	
<i>Junior High Subtotal</i>		2,911 <u>2,400</u>	
High Schools			
Existing High Schools	Existing	2,064 <u>1,964</u> ^a	<u>2,142</u>
NMP High School Satellite at CEC	By 2015-16	80 <u>200</u> <u>250</u> ^c	
<i>High School Subtotal</i>		2,144 <u>2,264</u> <u>2,214</u>	
Totals		10,513 10,633 <u>9,522</u>	<u>9,092</u><u>9,012</u>

^a Jones & Stokes 2000 (elementary capacity assumes full occupation of Marguerite Montgomery Elementary).

^{b-a} DJUSD 2002(b)

Volume IV

~~^{e-b} 2003 LRDP Section 4.11 Population and Housing (Volume II)DJUSD 2001 (October 2001 enrollment)DJUSD 2002 (Independent Study Enrollment).The CEC's high school component would have capacity for up to 250 students.
CEC = Community Education Center~~

DRAFT EIR SECTION 4.14 TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING

The following changes to the Section 4.14, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking in the Draft EIR are the result of internal review and comments received on the Draft EIR. In particular, changes were made throughout the section to reflect the fact that the previously considered option to have a vehicular connection between the neighborhood and Russell Boulevard has been disfavored. In addition, in response to comments received on the Draft EIR, traffic data were gathered and analyzed at additional locations in the City of Davis and along freeways. That analysis has been incorporated into the EIR. These changes do not affect the significance or the severity of the impacts as assessed in the Draft EIR.

Section 4.14.1.1, Motorized Roadway System, has been revised in a number of locations to incorporate data from traffic studies conducted after the release of the Draft EIR, as shown below:

Page 4.14-12:

Study Freeway Facilities. Traffic counts also were conducted in November 2001 during the AM and PM peak hours on I-80 and SR 113 at the Old Davis Road, Hutchison Drive, and Russell Boulevard ~~intersections~~ interchanges. Additional traffic counts were collected on I-80 between the Richards Boulevard and Mace Boulevard interchanges and east of the Mace Boulevard interchange in August 2003. These volumes were collected to determine the operations of freeway facilities at the adjacent interchanges.

Page 4.14-15:

Freeway Mainline. Freeway mainline traffic operations are analyzed on segments of I-80 and on segments of SR 113 where a loop-on ramp results in the addition of a travel lane. A traditional ramp merge/diverge analysis is not valid for situations that result in the addition of a travel lane. The *HCM* determines the LOS on freeway mainline segments by comparing the density (in passenger car equivalents/mile/lane) to the thresholds shown in Table 4.14-5.

Page 4.14-18:

Freeway Facilities. Existing operations at study freeway facilities are summarized in Table 4.14-7. As shown, all study freeway facilities on SR 113 operate at LOS C or better and freeway facilities on I-80 operate at LOS D or better during the peak hours under existing conditions (Fehr and Pears Associates 2003a).

In Section 4.14.2.1, Standards of Significance, the minimum acceptable standard for a segment of Richards Boulevard was raised.

- LOS ~~F-E~~ E is the minimum acceptable LOS for Richards Boulevard between First Street and I-80.

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

A number of changes to both text and tables were made to Section 4.14.2.3, Analytical Results. These are shown in detail below. Because an option for a vehicle connection from the NMP to Russell Boulevard that was considered in the Draft EIR has since been disfavored by the campus, tables, figures and text that addressed only the connection option have been deleted in their entirety. New and revised information is also provided in tables and text in the Final EIR. These changes are indicated in the remainder of this section. Page numbers are provided as appropriate to indicate the location in the Draft EIR text where the revision was made.

**Table 4.14-19
Daily Roadway Volumes – Year 2015 No Project and With 2003 LRDP Conditions**

Roadway	Location	Year 2015 No Project	Year 2015 With 2003 LRDP
1. Russell Boulevard	East of Eisenhower Street	15,400	21,500 20,800
2. Russell Boulevard	West of Orchard Park Drive	23,800	29,600 29,400
3. Russell Boulevard	West of California Avenue	29,600	35,100
4. Russell Boulevard	East of College Park	30,700	35,700
5. La Rue Road	South of Russell Boulevard	17,700	23,200 23,400
6. La Rue Road	South of Orchard Park Circle	14,600	16,100
7. La Rue Road	East of Garrod Drive	8,800	10,600
8. California Avenue	South of Russell Boulevard	4,800	4,800
9. Howard Way	South of Russell Boulevard	8,900	9,000
10. A Street	North of First Street	3,700	3,600
11. A Street	South of First Street	12,400	13,400
12. First Street	West of C Street	6,700	6,400
13. Hutchison Drive	West of SR 113	3,700	18,800 24,700
14. Hutchison Drive	East of SR113	13,200	15,900
15. Old Davis Road	East of Mark Hall Drive	8,300	9,300
16. Old Davis Road	North of I-80	10,900	14,000
17. Old Davis Road	South of I-80	2,300	5,800
18. SR 113	South of Russell Boulevard	44,400	52,500 58,000
19. SR 113	South Hutchison Drive	44,500	54,700
20. I-80	East of Old Davis Road	154,200	163,700
21. County Road 98	South of Russell Boulevard	5,300	5,800
22. County Road 98	South of Putah Creek	4,000	4,000

Notes:

~~a. Includes NMP Access to Russell Boulevard.~~

Source: Fehr & Peers Associates 2003.

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

**Table 4.14-20
Comparison of Traffic Volumes at Campus Gateways**

Location	Existing (2001-02) Conditions		Year 2015 No Project ^a		Year 2015 With 2003 LRDP ^b	
	Volume	Percent	Volume	Percent	Volume	Percent
AM Peak Hour						
Old Davis Road North of I-80	810	17%	1,060	19%	1,320	20%
La Rue Road South of Russell Blvd.	880	19%	1,130	20%	1,5	24%
A Street South of First Street	730	16%	870	16%	940	15%
Hutchison Drive East of SR 113	1,230	26%	1,370	25%	1,540 <u>1,570</u>	24%
Howard Way South of Russell Blvd.	690	15%	750	14%	750	12%
California Ave. South of Russell Blvd.	330	7%	360	6%	360	5%
Total	4,670	100%	5,540	100%	6,4 <u>6,480</u>	100%
PM Peak Hour						
Old Davis Road North of I-80	790	16%	1,060	18%	1,200	17%
La Rue Road South of Russell Blvd.	1,250	25%	1,350	23%	1,9 <u>1,970</u>	28%
A Street South of First Street	870	17%	950	17%	1,100	16%
Hutchison Drive East of SR 113	1,120	22%	1,260	22%	1,560	23%
Howard Way South of Russell Blvd.	700	14%	770	13%	750	11%
California Ave. South of Russell Blvd.	330	6%	360	7%	360	5%
Total	5,060	100%	5,750	100%	6,900 <u>6,940</u>	100%
Daily Volumes						
Old Davis Road North of I-80	7,970	14%	10,900	16%	14,000	17%
La Rue Road	14,870	26%	17,700	26%	23,000	29%

**Table 4.14-20
Comparison of Traffic Volumes at Campus Gateways**

Location	Existing (2001-02) Conditions		Year 2015 No Project ^a		Year 2015 With 2003 LRDP ^b	
	Volume	Percent	Volume	Percent	Volume	Percent
South of Russell Blvd.					<u>23,400</u>	
A Street South of First Street	9,860	17%	12,400	18%	13,400	17%
Hutchison Drive East of SR 113	11,480	20%	13,200	20%	15,900	20%
Howard Way South of Russell Blvd.	8,720	15%	8,900	13%	9,000	11%
California Ave. South of Russell Blvd.	4,340	8%	4,800	7%	4,800	6%
Total	57,240	100%	67,900	100%	80,000 <u>80,500</u>	100%

Notes: a. Includes growth previously approved by UC Davis under 1994 LRDP.

b. ~~Includes NMP Access to Russell Boulevard.~~

Source: Fehr & Peers Associates 2003.

**Table 4.14-22
Intersection Operations – 2015 Conditions With 2003 LRDP***

Location	Traffic Control ^b Control ^a	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Russell Blvd./County Road 98	AWSC	11.1	B	10.3	B
2. Russell Blvd./Lake Blvd.	TWSC^e <u>TWSC^b</u>	10.5/24.8	B/C	38.3/>50.0	E/F
3. Russell Blvd./Arlington Blvd.	TWSC ^c	4.0/37.9 <u>4.7/41.3</u>	A/E	5.5/>50.0 <u>7.1>50.0</u>	A/F
4. Russell Blvd./Eisenhower Street	TWSC	3.2/41.9 <u>2.6/38.3</u>	A/E	4.7/43.1 <u>2.2/45.4</u>	A/E
5. Russell Blvd./Arthur Street	Signal	18.4 <u>16.8</u>	B	18.8 <u>13.9</u>	B
6. Russell Blvd./SB SR 113 Ramps	Signal	18.7 <u>18.6</u>	B	7.2 <u>7.6</u>	A
7. Russell Blvd./NB SR 113 Ramps	Signal	20.2 <u>20.6</u>	C	39.1 <u>49.3</u>	D
8. Russell Blvd./Orchard Park Drive*	TWSC	>50.0/>50.0	F/F	>50.0/>50.0	F/F
9. Russell Blvd./Sycamore Lane*	Signal	23.9 <u>23.8</u>	C	48.5 <u>42.6</u>	D
10. Russell Blvd./Anderson Rd./La Rue Rd.*	Signal	35.8 <u>37.6</u>	D	42.3 <u>44.0</u>	D
11. Russell Blvd./California Avenue	TWSC	2.0/21.0	A/C	7.4/>50.0	A/F
12. Russell Blvd./Oak Avenue*	Signal	6.8	A	11.0	B
13. Russell Blvd./College Park/Howard Way*	Signal	24.5	C	35.7	D
14. Russell Blvd./A Street*	Signal	10.4	B	11.2	B
15. Russell Blvd./Fifth Street/B Street	Signal	30.9	C	32.0	C
16. Orchard Park Drive/Orchard Park Circle*	AWSC	8.9	A	9.3	A
17. Orchard Road/La Rue Road*	Signal	25.4	C	>80.0	F

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

**Table 4.14-22
Intersection Operations – 2015 Conditions With 2003 LRDP***

Location	Traffic Control ^b Control ^a	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
18. Third Street/B Street*	Signal	6.4	A	10.2	B
19. Hutchison Drive/County Road 98	TWSC	7.2/24.8	A/C	24.0/>50.0	C/F
20. Hutchison Drive/Hopkins Road	TWSC	5.4/12.7	A/B	19.8/39.1	C/E
21. Hutchison Drive/SB SR 113 Ramps	TWSC	>50.0/>50.0	F/F	7.3/46.1 16.4/>50.0	A/E /F
22. Hutchison Drive/NB SR 113 Ramps	TWSC	>50.0/>50.0	F/F	>50.0/>50.0	F/F
23. Hutchison Drive/Health Sciences Drive	Signal	40.6/40.4	D	52.8/52.2	D
24. Extension Center Dr./Orchard Park Dr.	TWSC	3.6/9.1	A/A	4.1/9.4	A/A
25. Hutchison Drive/Extension Center Drive	TWSC	4.0/>50.0	A/F	42.1/>50.0	E/F
26. Hutchison Drive/La Rue Road*	Signal	34.5/35.3	C	78.0 /80.0	E
27. Hutchison Drive/Dairy Road	Signal	26.2	C	43.9	D
28. Hutchison Drive/Kleiber Hall Drive*	AWSC	9.4	A	15.9	C
29. Hutchison Drive/Bioletti Way	AWSC	9.5	A	13.5	B
30. First Street/A Street*	TWSC	29.9/>50.0	D/F	>50.0/>50.0	F/F
31. First Street/B Street*	AWSC	35.1	E	33.6	D
32. First Street/D Street	Signal	18.2	B	19.3	B
33. First Street/E Street/Richards Blvd. ^{dc}	Signal	58.4	E	>80.0	F
34. Olive Drive/Richards Blvd. ^{dc}	Signal	39.8	D	34.1	C
35. Richards Blvd./I-80 Ramps ^d Ramps ^c	Signal	>80.0	F	>80.0	F
36. Richards Blvd./Research Park Dr. ^{dc}	Signal	40.4	D	>80.0	F
37. Old Davis Road/A Street	AWSC	35.0	D	40.8	E
38. Garrod Drive/La Rue Road	TWSC	3.0/41.9	A/E	16.9/>50.0	C/F
39. La Rue Road/Dairy Road	TWSC	2.7/>50.0	A/F	7.4/>40.0	A/E
40. La Rue Road/Bioletti Way	TWSC	3.7/28.1	A/D	12.0/>50.0	B/F
41. Old Davis Road/Mrak Hall Drive	AWSC	14.1	B	19.8	C
42. New Davis Road/Beau Vine Lane	TWSC	7.4/>50.0	A/F	39.8/>50.0	E/F
43. New Davis Road/California Avenue	TWSC	>50.0/>50.0	F/F	>50.0/>50.0	F/F
44. WB I-80 Ramps/Old Davis Road	TWSC	>50.0/>50.0	F/F	11.1/>50.0	B/F
45. EB I-80 Ramps/Old Davis Road	TWSC	>50.0/>50.0	F/F	>50.0/>50.0	F/F

Notes: * Bicyclists included in the LOS calculations at signalized intersections.

~~a. Includes NMP connection to Russell Blvd.~~

~~b.~~ a. AWSC = All way stop controlled intersection. TWSC = Two way stop controlled intersection.

~~b.~~ Results shown in average overall intersection delay & LOS / delay & LOS for critical movement.

~~c.~~ Unique conditions of Richards Boulevard discussed in text of this report.

Shaded boxes indicate unacceptable LOS and significant impact.

Source: Fehr & Peers Associates 2003.

Page 4.14-65

The worst-case movement for unsignalized study intersections is expected to operate unacceptably at the intersections listed below. ~~Although unacceptable operations for the worst-case movement at these locations are not significant project impacts,~~ Improvements are identified to improve operations for the worst-case movement for use by UC Davis in future planning. Traffic operations for the worst-case movement could be improved by implementing the measures discussed below.

Volume IV

Table 4.14-23 and associated text were deleted and replaced with updated information.

**Table 4.14-23
Intersection Operations—Year 2015 Conditions With 2003 LRDP
Without NMP Connection to Russell Boulevard***

Location	Traffic Control ^b	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
3. Russell Blvd./Arlington Blvd.	TWSC ^e	4.7/41.3	A/E	7.1/>50.0	A/F
4. Russell Blvd./Eisenhower Street	TWSC	2.6/38.3	A/E	2.2/45.4	A/E
5. Russell Blvd./Arthur Street	Signal	16.8	B	13.9	B
6. Russell Blvd./SB SR 113 Ramps	Signal	18.6	B	7.6	A
7. Russell Blvd./NB SR 113 Ramps	Signal	20.6	C	49.3	D
9. Russell Blvd./Sycamore Lane*	Signal	23.8	C	42.6	D
10. Russell Blvd./Anderson Rd./La Rue Rd.*	Signal	37.6	D	44.0	D
21. Hutchison Drive/SB SR 113 Ramps	TWSC	>50.0/>50.0	F/F	16.4/>50.0	C/F
22. Hutchison Drive/NB SR 113 Ramps	TWSC	>50.0/>50.0	F/F	>50.0/>50.0	F/F
23. Hutchison Drive/Health Sciences Drive	Signal	40.4	D	52.2	D
26. Hutchison Drive/La Rue Road*	Signal	35.3	D	>80.0	F

Notes: * Bicyclists included in the LOS calculations at signalized intersections.

a. NMP access only provided on Hutchison Drive.

b. AWSC = All way stop controlled intersection. TWSC = Two way stop controlled intersection.

c. Results shown in average overall intersection delay & LOS / delay & LOS for critical movement.

Shaded boxes indicate unacceptable LOS.

Source: Fehr & Peers Associates 2003.

As shown in Table 4.14-23, the following study intersections in the vicinity of the NMP would operate unacceptably in 2015 with the implementation of the 2003 LRDP without the NMP access to Russell Boulevard. Traffic operations at the remaining study intersections identified above in Table 4.14-22 would not be adversely affected by eliminating NMP access to Russell Boulevard.

The Hutchison Drive/SR 113 SB Ramp intersection would degrade from LOS B to LOS F during the AM peak hour.

The Hutchison Drive/SR 113 NB Ramp intersection would degrade from LOS B to LOS F during the AM peak hour, and from LOS A to LOS F during the PM peak hour.

The Hutchison Drive/La Rue Road intersection would degrade from LOS D to LOS F during the PM peak hour.

The worst case movement for unsignalized study intersections is expected to operate unacceptably at the intersections listed below under 2015 conditions with the 2003 LRDP without the NMP connection to Russell Boulevard.

Russell Boulevard/Arlington Boulevard (northbound left turn movement operates at LOS F during the PM peak hour)

- The installation of a roundabout or traffic signal would improve operations for the worst case movement and would provide acceptable operations for the overall intersection. This intersection does not meet Caltrans' Peak Hour Traffic Signal Warrant in 2015 with the implementation of the 2003 LRDP.

Freeway Operations. The peak hour traffic volumes developed with the Davis TDF model were used to determine the LOS at the study freeway facilities during the AM and PM peak hours. In addition to determining operations at the SR 113/Hutchison Drive, SR 113/Russell Boulevard, and I-80/Old Davis Road interchanges, operations were also analyzed on I-80 between Richards Boulevard and Mace Boulevard and east of Mace Boulevard and at the I-80/Pedrick Road

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

interchange in the City of Dixon. Year 2015 traffic volumes at the I-80/Pedrick Road interchange were developed using the City of Dixon Travel Demand Forecasting Model. The *2001 Regional Transportation Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area* includes the widening of I-80 to four lanes in each direction between I-505 in Vacaville to Pedrick Road in Dixon. However, since the timing of this improvement may occur after 2015, I-80 was analyzed as three lanes in each direction in the vicinity of the Pedrick Road interchange.

Tables ~~4.14-23 and 4.14-24, 4.14-25, and 4.14-26~~ summarize the peak hour LOS results under 2015 No Project conditions ~~and, 2015 conditions with the 2003 LRDP, and 2015 conditions with the 2003 LRDP without the NMP connection to Russell Boulevard~~, respectively.

As shown in Table 4.14-24, most freeway facilities would operate acceptably under 2015 No Project conditions except for the ramp junctions at the I-80/Pedrick Road interchange and the I-80 mainline east of Mace Boulevard, which would operate at LOS F.

As shown in Table 4.14-25, the following study freeway facilities would operate unacceptably in 2015 with the implementation of the 2003 LRDP.

- The weave section on NB SR 113 between Hutchison Drive and Russell Boulevard would degrade from LOS C to LOS D during the PM peak hour.
- The ramp junctions at the I-80/Pedrick Road interchange would continue to operate at LOS F during the AM and PM peak hours.
- The WB I-80 mainline between Richards Boulevard and Mace Boulevard would degrade from LOS E to LOS F during the PM peak hour.
- The EB I-80 mainline east of Mace Boulevard would continue to operate at LOS F during the AM and PM peak hours.
- The WB I-80 mainline east of Mace Boulevard would degrade from LOS E to LOS F during the AM peak hour and would continue to operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour.

Tables 4.14-24 and 4.14-25 were revised with updated information and the table numbers were changed.

~~As shown in Table 4.14-26, the following study freeway facilities in the vicinity of the NMP would operate unacceptably in 2015 with the implementation of the 2003 LRDP without the NMP access to Russell Boulevard. Traffic operations at the remaining study freeway facilities identified above in Table 4.14-25 (i.e., the I-80/Old Davis Road and I-80/Pedrick Road interchanges) would not be affected by eliminating NMP access to Russell Boulevard.~~

- ~~□ The weave section on NB SR 113 between Hutchison Drive and Russell Boulevard would degrade from LOS C to LOS D during the PM peak hour.~~

Table 4.14-2423
Freeway Operations – Year 2015 No Project Conditions

Location	AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
	Mainline Volume	Ramp Volume	Density ^a	LOS	Mainline Volume	Ramp Volume	Density ^a	LOS
SR 113 Freeway Facilities								
<i>Freeway Mainline Analysis</i>								
NB SR 113 at Hutchison Dr. (after loop on-ramp)	1,570	-	7.9	A	2,420	-	12.1	B
SB SR 113 at Russell Blvd. (after loop on-ramp)	2,400	-	9.0	A	1,550	-	5.8	A
SB SR 113 at Hutchison Dr. (after loop on-ramp)	3,140	-	9.1	A	2,130	-	8.0	A

Volume IV

Table 4.14-2423
Freeway Operations – Year 2015 No Project Conditions

Location	AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
	Mainline Volume	Ramp Volume	Density ^a	LOS	Mainline Volume	Ramp Volume	Density ^a	LOS
<i>Weave Section Analysis</i>								
NB SR 113 – I-80 to Hutchison Dr.	-	1,120 ^b	15.8	B	-	1,160 ^b	15.1	B
		690 ^c				250 ^c		
NB SR 113 – Hutchison Dr. to Russell Blvd.	-	50 ^b	11.9	B	-	350 ^b	25.8	C
		520 ^c				750 ^c		
SB SR 113 – Russell Blvd. to Hutchison Dr.	-	530 ^b	15.2	B	-	240 ^b	8.9	A
		580 ^c				130 ^c		
SB SR 113 – Hutchison Dr. to I-80	-	80 ^b	11.5	B	-	120 ^b	10.2	B
		820 ^c				740 ^c		
<i>Ramp Junction Analysis</i>								
NB SR 113 – Russell Blvd. Diagonal On-ramp	1,100	120	13.9	B	2,016	260	22.7	C
SB SR 113 – Russell Blvd. Diagonal Off-ramp	2,400	290	24.5	C	1,479	250	16.1	B
I-80 Freeway Facilities								
<i>Freeway Mainline Analysis</i>								
<u>EB I-80 - Richards Boulevard to Mace Boulevard</u>	<u>5,170</u>	-	<u>29.5</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>5,800</u>	-	<u>35.9</u>	<u>E</u>
<u>WB I-80 - Richards Boulevard to Mace Boulevard</u>	<u>5,460</u>	-	<u>32.1</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>6,210</u>	-	<u>41.7</u>	<u>E</u>
<u>EB I-80 - East of Mace Boulevard</u>	<u>7,070</u>	-	<u>*</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>6,400</u>	-	<u>*</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>WB I-80 – East of Mace Boulevard</u>	<u>6,250</u>	-	<u>42.4</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>7,350</u>	-	<u>*</u>	<u>F</u>
<i>Ramp Junction Analysis</i>								
EB I-80 – Old Davis Rd. Off-ramp	5,440	210	25.6	C	5,276	50	24.1	C
EB I-80 – Old Davis Rd. On-ramp	5,810	120	5.0	A	6,118	510	8.5	A
WB I-80 – Old Davis Rd. Off-ramp	5,640	540	23.7	C	6,193	160	23.6	C
WB I-80 – Old Davis Rd. On-ramp	5,100	40	15.9	B	6,034	200	18.4	B
EB I-80 – Pedrick Rd. Off-ramp	7,090	420	40.3	F	6,781	440	39.2	F
EB I-80 – Pedrick Rd. On-ramp	6,670	380	38.4	F	6,344	480	37.2	F
WB I-80 – Pedrick Rd. Off-ramp	6,790	390	38.5	F	7,171	500	39.9	F
WB I-80 – Pedrick Rd. On-ramp	6,410	260	36.2	F	6,672	420	38.4	F

Notes:

- a. Density reported in passenger cars per mile per lane (pc/mi/ln)
- b. On-ramp volume
- c. Off-ramp volume

Source: Fehr & Peers Associates 2003.

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

**Table 4.14-2524
Freeway Operations – Year 2015 Conditions With 2003 LRDP^a**

Location	AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour				
	Mainline Volume	Ramp Volume	Density ^b Density ^a	LOS	Mainline Volume	Ramp Volume	Density ^b Density ^a	LOS	
SR 113 Freeway Facilities									
<i>Freeway Mainline Analysis</i>									
NB SR 113 at Hutchison Dr. (after loop on-ramp)	1,740 <u>1,790</u>	-	8.7 <u>9.08</u>	A	2,790 <u>2,860</u>	-	14.0 <u>14.5</u>	B	
SB SR 113 at Russell Blvd. (after loop on-ramp)	2,610 <u>2,710</u>	-	9.8 <u>10.2</u>	A	1,950 <u>2,100</u>	-	7.3 <u>7.9</u>	A	
SB SR 113 at Hutchison Dr. (after loop on-ramp)	2,390 <u>2,380</u>	-	9.0	A	2,360	-	8.9	A	
<i>Weave Section Analysis</i>									
NB SR 113 – I-80 to Hutchison Dr.	-	1,250 ^{be}	19.4	B	-	1,620 ^e	23.5	C	
		950 ^{de}				1,640 ^b			23.9
						680 ^d			
NB SR 113 – Hutchison Dr. to Russell Blvd.	-	50 ^e 60 ^b	13.714.3	B	-	400 ^e	31.0	D	
		590 ^d				350 ^b			
		620 ^c				820 ^d			
SB SR 113 – Russell Blvd. to Hutchison Dr.	-	530 ^{eb}	17.618.7	B	-	360 ^e	11.3	B	
		870 ^d				330 ^b			
		970 ^c				490 ^d			
SB SR 113 – Hutchison Dr. to I-80	-	240 ^e	12.312.4	B	-	340 ^{eb}	12.7	B	
		260 ^b				880 ^{de}			
		870 ^d							
<i>Ramp Junction Analysis</i>									
NB SR 113 – Russell Blvd. Diagonal On-ramp	1,210 <u>1,230</u>	120 <u>110</u>	13.8 <u>12.8</u>	B2.2 <u>90</u>	2,370 <u>410</u>	370 <u>26.2</u>	26.5	C	
SB SR 113 – Russell Blvd. Diagonal Off-ramp	2,690 <u>2,750</u>	380 <u>370</u>	27.1 <u>27.6</u>	C	1,700 <u>1,740</u>	280	18.1 <u>18.5</u>	B	
I-80 Freeway Facilities									

Volume IV

Table 4.14-2524
Freeway Operations – Year 2015 Conditions With 2003 LRDP^a

Location	AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
	Mainline Volume	Ramp Volume	Density ^b Density ^a	LOS	Mainline Volume	Ramp Volume	Density ^b Density ^a	LOS
<i>Freeway Mainline Analysis</i>								
<u>EB I-80 - Richards Boulevard to Mace Boulevard</u>	<u>5,230</u>	-	<u>30.0</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>5,890</u>	-	<u>37.0</u>	<u>E</u>
<u>WB I-80 - Richards Boulevard to Mace Boulevard</u>	<u>5,740</u>	-	<u>35.2</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>6,440</u>	-	<u>*</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>EB I-80 - East of Mace Boulevard</u>	<u>7,160</u>	-	<u>*</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>6,850</u>	-	<u>*</u>	<u>F</u>
<u>WB I-80 - East of Mace Boulevard</u>	<u>6,720</u>	-	<u>*</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>7,500</u>	-	<u>*</u>	<u>F</u>
<i>Ramp Junction Analysis</i>								
EB I-80 – Old Davis Rd. Off-ramp	5,600	370	27.0	C	5,200	100	24.1	C
EB I-80 – Old Davis Rd. On-ramp	5,920	170	5.6	A	6,250	630	9.7	A
WB I-80 – Old Davis Rd. Off-ramp	6,020	770	26.1	C	6,610	230	25.4	C
WB I-80 – Old Davis Rd. On-ramp	5,250	50	16.3	B	6,380	290	19.3	B
EB I-80 – Pedrick Rd. Off-ramp	7,280	420	40.9	F	6,850	440	39.5	F
EB I-80 – Pedrick Rd. On-ramp	6,870	460	39.9	F	6,410	460	37.8	F
WB I-80 – Pedrick Rd. Off-ramp	6,850	400	38.7	F	7,450	580	40.8	F
WB I-80 – Pedrick Rd. On-ramp	6,450	260	36.4	F	6,870	420	40.4	F

Notes:

2003a. ~~Includes NMP connection to Russell Blvd.~~

^ba. Density reported in passenger cars per mile per lane (pc/mi/ln)

^eb. On-ramp volume

^ec. Off-ramp volume

Source: Fehr & Peers Associates

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

Table 4.14-26
Freeway Operations – Year 2015 Conditions With 2003 LRDP
Without NMP Connection to Russell Boulevard*

Location	AM Peak Hour				PM Peak Hour			
	Mainline Volume	Ramp Volume	Density ^b	LOS	Mainline Volume	Ramp Volume	Density ^b	LOS
SR 113 Freeway Facilities								
<i>Freeway Mainline Analysis</i>								
NB SR 113 at Hutchison Dr. (after loop on-ramp)	1,790	-	9.0	A	2,860	-	14.5	B
SB SR 113 at Russell Blvd. (after loop on-ramp)	2,710	-	10.2	A	2,100	-	7.9	A
SB SR 113 at Hutchison Dr. (after loop on-ramp)	2,380	-	9.0	A	2,360	-	8.9	A
<i>Weave Section Analysis</i>								
NB SR 113 – I 80 to Hutchison Dr.	-	1,250 ^e	19.4	B	-	1,640 ^e	23.9	C
		950 ^d				710 ^d		
NB SR 113 – Hutchison Dr. to Russell Blvd.	-	60 ^e	14.3	B	-	350 ^e	32.1	D
		620 ^d				940 ^d		
SB SR 113 – Russell Blvd. to Hutchison Dr.	-	530 ^e	18.7	B	-	330 ^e	12.1	B
		970 ^d				600 ^d		
SB SR 113 – Hutchison Dr. to I 80	-	260 ^e	12.4	B	-	340 ^e	12.7	B
		880 ^d				880 ^d		
<i>Ramp Junction Analysis</i>								
NB SR 113 – Russell Blvd. Diagonal On-ramp	1,230	110	12.8	B	2,290	410	26.2	C
SB SR 113 – Russell Blvd. Diagonal Off-ramp	2,750	370	27.6	C	1,740	280	18.5	B

Notes:

- a. NMP access only provided on Hutchison Drive.
- b. Density reported in passenger cars per mile per lane (pc/mi/ln)
- e. On-ramp volume
- d. Off-ramp volume

Source: Fehr & Peers Associates 2003.

- The I-80 mainline east of Mace Boulevard would operate at LOS F during the AM peak hour in the eastbound direction and during the PM peak hour in the eastbound and westbound directions with and without the implementation of the 2003 LRDP, resulting in a significant impact. In addition, the I-80 mainline east of Mace Boulevard would degrade from LOS E to LOS F during the AM peak hour in the westbound direction and the I-80 mainline between Richards Boulevard and Mace Boulevard would degrade from LOS E to LOS F during the PM peak hour in the westbound direction. I-80 is included in the Yolo County CMP; therefore, this is also a CMP impact. The following measure would improve operations to LOS E or better during the AM and PM peak hours, reducing the impact to a less-than-significant level.
 1. Widen I-80 to provide a high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction between Richards Boulevard and Mace Boulevard and east of Mace Boulevard.

This improvement is identified in the Caltrans *Interstate 80 Transportation Concept Report* and in the SACOG *Metropolitan Transportation Plan for 2025*. However, since this improvement is not expected to occur before 2015, it was not assumed in place for the 2015 analysis.

The *Interstate 80 Transportation Concept Report* also identifies that traffic operations on I-80 from the Solano/Yolo County line to Sacramento County are expected to decline to LOS F by 2020. According to the concept report, the following improvements would provide LOS E operations in 2020: (1) construct HOV lanes (one in each direction); (2) increase Yolo County bus service; (3) increase Yolobus service; (4) implement Smart Corridor Technology; and (5) implement Traffic Operation Systems such as ramp metering and changeable message signs.

To determine if the improvements identified by Caltrans would provide acceptable operations in 2015 with the implementation of the 2003 LRDP, I-80 was re-analyzed with the addition of one HOV lane in each direction. Fehr & Peers collected traffic counts along I-80 in Solano County in March 2001 to determine the number of high occupancy vehicles (i.e., two or more persons) currently traveling on I-80. The percentage of HOVs ranged between 13 to 21 percent during the AM peak hour and 24 to 30 percent during the PM peak hour. Therefore, the HOV lanes on I-80 in the vicinity of Richards Boulevard and Mace Boulevard were assumed to serve 15 percent of vehicles traveling on I-80 during the peak hours. Although 15 percent is likely a low estimate for 2015 conditions, assuming that 15 percent of vehicles use the HOV lane would improve peak hour operations to LOS E or better in 2015 with the implementation of the 2003 LRDP.

DRAFT EIR SECTION 4.15 UTILITIES

The following changes to Section 4.15, Volume II of the Draft EIR (Utilities), are the result of internal review and comments received on the Draft EIR. These changes do not affect the significance or the severity of the impacts as assessed in the Draft EIR.

The description of the domestic and fire water system on campus in Section 4.15.1.1, Water Supply, and Table 4.15-1, which provides the related data, were amended to correct and update a misstatement of capacity and to explain the relationship between fire and domestic water use. These changes do not alter the significance or the severity of impacts reported in the Draft EIR.

As presented in Table 4.15-1, peak hour capacity of the campus' domestic/fire water system in 2000 (including wells, storage, and booster pumping) was estimated at approximately 9,000-10,890 gpm. With the recent addition of a new water tank, the system's capacity has increased since 2000, and as of summer 2003 the system's capacity is approximately 10,130 gpm (Phillips 2003d). Annual use of water from the system in 2001 was estimated at approximately 867-million gallons per year (mgy) or 2,661 acre-feet (West Yost & Associates 2000a, Phillips 2003a). During emergency conditions, the domestic/fire water system can be cross-connected with the campus utility water system and with the City of Davis water system. Deep aquifer water demand and supply are discussed further in Section 4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality (Volume II).

**Table 4.15-1
Existing and Projected Demand for Utilities**

Utility	2001-02 Consumption & Demand		LRDP Consumption & Demand (not Not including NMP)		NMP Consumption & Demand		Total Through 2015-16
	Annual Consumption	Peak Demand	Annual Consumption	Peak Demand	Annual Consumption	Peak Demand	Annual Consumption
Domestic/Fire Water	26612,671 ac-ft	3,100 gpm	4,877 ac-ft	4,335 gpm ¹	424 ac-ft	9463821 gpm ²	5,301 ac-ft
Utility Water	1,170 ac-ft	1.5 mgd	948 ac-ft	1.8 mgd	436 ac-ft	0.85mgd	1,384 ac-ft
Wastewater	650 mg	1.6 mgd	1,400 mg	3.5 mgd	178 mg	0.35 mgd	1578 mg
Solid Waste	8,700 tons	NA	17,811.6 tons	NA	Included in LRDP	NA	17,811.6 tons
Electricity	200,000,000 KWh	34,000 KW	506,000,000 KWh	107,000 KW	13,154,000 KWh	6,473 KW	519,000,000 KWh
Natural Gas	16,800,000 therms	2,900 therms/hr	45,000,000 therms	6,700 therms/hr	1,298,000 therms	495 therms/hr	46,128,000 therms

1. LRDP peak domestic water demand does not include fire water demand projections. Fire water demand relates to the size and construction types of specific buildings, characteristics that would be speculative to project for campus-wide growth at this time. Regardless, environmental effects associated with all likely expansions to the domestic/fire water system have been assessed and are determined to be less than significant (see LRDP Impact 4.15-1).
2. In addition to the NMP's peak demand for 946 gpm of water for domestic purposes, the Neighborhood would have a peak demand for fire protection of 2,875 gpm, for a total domestic/fire water demand of 3,821 gpm.

Source: UC Davis Architects and Engineers 2003.
Phillips, David. 2003a. Memo to Sid England. Domestic Water Projections.
Phillips, David. 2003b. Memo to Sid England. Utility Water Projections.

The explanatory text following LRDP Mitigation 4.15-3 was revised to clarify the description of sewer system capacity and the potential for new lines to be needed. The revision does not affect the significance or the severity of the impact as assessed in the Draft EIR.

LRDP Impact 4.15-3: Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of wastewater treatment and conveyance facilities, the construction and operation of which would not result in significant environmental impacts.

Except for a few sewer lines on the central campus that require upsizing even under current conditions, most central campus sewer lines are of adequate size to handle increased flows due to growth under the 2003 LRDP. Environmental impacts from the replacement of existing central campus sewer lines with new larger sewer lines would be minimal. New lines and/or replacement of existing lines may be needed to serve new developments on the west campus (such as the proposed NMP), and minor extensions to the existing conveyance facilities on both the south and west campuses may be needed to connect other individual projects. No upsizing is necessary for the primary south campus sewer lines. Per campus practice of locating all linear utilities within road rights-of-way where feasible, new or expanded sewer lines would likely be located within existing road rights-of-way, areas that have already been disturbed where cultural and biological resources would likely not occur. Furthermore, the campus would implement as appropriate LRDP mitigations that include pre-construction surveys and monitoring to avoid inadvertent impacts to biological and cultural resources during construction of pipeline expansions and extensions. Potential impacts of erosion and water quality effects from trenching and constructing in rights-of-way would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels through implementation of 2003 LRDP mitigations presented in Section 4.8 Hydrology and Water Quality. To further reduce this impact, the campus would implement LRDP Mitigation 4.15-3, which would ensure that when specific projects are proposed in the future under the 2003 LRDP, each project identifies any offsite utility improvements triggered by the project so that the environmental effects of those offsite improvements are considered in the environmental evaluation of the project.

In the Draft EIR, the significance of LRDP Impact 4.15-7 was inadvertently misstated. The revision does not affect the significance or the severity of the impact as assessed in the Draft EIR.

The impact remains significant and unavoidable.

LRDP Impact 4.15-7: Implementation of the 2003 LRDP would require the expansion of natural gas transmission systems, which would result in environmental impacts.

Significance: ~~Potentially s~~Significant

The following reference was added to Section 4.15.3 with respect to the capacity and demand for domestic and fire water.

Philips, David. 2003d. Email from David Phillips, UC Davis Operations and Maintenance to Sarah Mattern, UC Davis Office of Resource Management and Planning. September 9, 2003.

DRAFT EIR SECTION 7.0 OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

Section 7.2 reports all significant and unavoidable impacts of the 2003 LRDP. Minor editorial revisions to Impacts 4.2-1, 4.10-2, and 4.14-2 were made, consistent with the changes described above in full.

OTHER RESOURCES AND ADDITIONAL SECTIONS

There were minor editorial revisions, but no substantive revisions to the following sections: Section 4.13, Recreation; Section 5.0, Alternatives; Section 7.0, Growth Inducing Impacts, Section 8.0, Consultation and Coordination, or Section 9.0. List of Preparers and Contributors. Revisions to Section 6.0, Other CEQA Considerations, are captured in the revisions provided in full, above.

3.3 CHANGES TO VOLUME III

DRAFT EIR SECTION 2.0 NEIGHBORHOOD MASTER PLAN

The following changes to Neighborhood Master Plan, Section 2.0 of Volume III of the Draft EIR, are the result of internal review and comments received on the Draft EIR. These changes did not alter the significance or the severity of any impact.

Section 2.3 Detailed Project Description

Text revisions made in project description details in a number of subsections are described below.

In the Draft EIR, Section 2.3.4.1 Faculty/Staff Housing included a numerical error in housing units that was inconsistent with data on housing units presented in Tables 2.3 and 2.4. In the discussion in the revised text, the 20 live/work units reported in the Draft EIR are considered as a subset of the attached townhomes. The revised Table 2.4 (formerly 2-3) also includes a minor correction in the number of acres to be developed during each phase of the plan.

The proposed Neighborhood is planned with capacity for approximately 275 single-family detached homes, ~~10080~~ attached townhouses, 100 faculty/staff apartments, ~~20 live/work units for faculty and staff~~, and 25 units in the Multi-Use Housing Center (see below). These residential units would either be sold or rented to faculty and staff. Together, these units would accommodate a population of approximately 1,240 faculty, staff, and their families. Many single-family dwellings would have an optional cottage unit that could be rented. It is anticipated that 55 percent of single-family homes would include such cottages, which could provide additional rental housing for students. UC Davis would manage the long-term affordability of faculty and staff housing through the use of long-term ground leases and resale controls on for-sale housing.

Additional information is also provided in the text regarding NMP design objectives for faculty and staff housing.

The NMP specifies design objectives for the faculty and staff housing that would border the buffer area along Russell Boulevard. Homes closest to Russell Boulevard (at least 200 feet south of the road) would include a range of styles and sizes, and would have narrow tree-lined roadways, decks, front porches, and entries opening to public spaces (see Chapter IV, Neighborhood Districts, of the NMP). The NMP includes environmental design guidelines, calling for solar access, building orientation to take advantage of the prevailing cooling breezes, on-site drainage, and emphasis on bicycle and bus access to the campus. While specific materials and architectural details are not specified in the NMP, the plan does include guidelines for building placement, the relationship of buildings to streets and open spaces, parking placement, and open space characteristics of the proposed housing, as well as all other proposed neighborhood elements. Parking lots and/or structured parking would be provided for faculty/staff apartments.

Like student apartments, the faculty/staff apartments would be designed to enhance the urban character of the Neighborhood. Faculty/staff apartments would be provided with outdoor ground floor patios or upper-floor decks. All housing would be oriented toward streets or public and community open spaces to encourage pedestrian activity and interaction. To the same ends, front-yard fencing would be low, to provide good visibility of residential buildings and easy access to alleys and public and community open space. Parking lots and/or structured parking would be provided for faculty/staff apartments.

The areas designated for student housing in the NMP were revised to include a small amount of additional area, so that sufficient parking could be provided to accommodate the needs of all student residents. The text in Section 2.3.4.2 was revised to reflect the change.

Approximately ~~3130~~ acres of land are designed for student housing in the NMP. Student housing within the Neighborhood would be provided at a range of densities, typically would consist of three- to four-story mid-rise apartments with a combination of surface lots and structured parking, and also would include cottage or studio apartments on single-family and townhouse lots. Student apartments would have an overall density of approximately 30 units per acre.

Student apartment buildings would be located near the eastern margin of the Neighborhood close to the central campus and adjacent to the recreation fields, which would be in the south-central part of the development. These buildings would provide approximately 945 apartment units, which would include about 80 student family apartments and 865 student apartments. Together these units are expected to accommodate approximately 3,000 students, 55 other adults, and 55 children under 18. In addition, many single-family houses intended for faculty and staff would include detached cottages, which could be rented to students by the owners of the faculty/staff housing, as described above. It is estimated that about 150 such units, which could house about 225 students, would be available at build-out.

Parking would be provided within or near student housing areas to accommodate the parking needs of all student residents for approximately 75 percent of the student population. This exceeds the City of Davis standard of two parking spaces for each three-bedroom apartment. Most parking would be surface parking, but some podium parking on the first floor or a half-story below grade would also be available. Parking would be situated predominantly at the sides and backs of buildings. Additional parking facilities will be constructed around facilities in the Recreation Fields facilities area, if needed.

The land to accommodate the change described above would be provided by redesignation of about one unused acre of land at the Heidrick Western Center for Academic/Administrative Low Density use. Text in the EIR was revised to reflect this change.

The Heidrick Western Center for Agricultural Equipment currently operates in a facility on an approximately 7-acre parcel at the southeastern corner of the project site, south of Hutchison Drive. The NMP designates the majority of the site of the existing facility headquarters as Academic/Administrative Low Density to enable this facility to continue to operate at this location. A one-acre area at the northwestern corner of this parcel, which is not needed for the operation of the Western Center, has been designated Student Housing, in order to provide sufficient area should additional student parking be needed. Thus, six acres are designated Academic/Administrative Low Density for the Heidrick Western Center.

Some additional future parking might also be provided within the formal recreation fields, as described in Section 2.3.4.9, Physical Education/Intercollegiate Athletics/ Recreation.

Formal recreational fields north of Hutchison Drive would provide expanded athletic opportunities for campus affiliates and local community members, and would help to meet the campus' currently unmet needs for recreational fields. Situated adjacent to the CEC and near the Mixed-Use Housing Center, the recreational fields would be part of the entryway into the Neighborhood.

Unused areas within the Recreation Fields designation area, such as tennis court and baseball field margins, could be used for additional parking facilities for student residents and users of the recreation fields, as needed.

More detail on the revisions to the plan for student parking are explained in Section 2.3.6.4, Parking.

- Parking would be provided at a rate of 3 spaces per 4 beds in student housing projects, onsite in surface parking lots, parking tucked under housing, or parking structures. If parking demand exceeds this supply, then overflow parking will be provided near the recreation fields area to prevent parking pressure on university and City neighborhoods to the north.

2.3.4.7, Formal Open Space, was revised to describe the small pocket park that has been added in the NMP.

A small park would be located at the northern terminus of the NMP's principal north-south roadway, and would provide a transition to the greenbelt habitat area along Russell Boulevard. Where possible, pocket parks would include playgrounds and informal open space to provide play and gathering areas.

Revisions are made throughout the project description to indicate that the NMP as described in the Final EIR no longer includes an option for a vehicular connection with Russell Boulevard. This change is described in Section 2.3.6.1, Roadways.

Principal vehicular entry to the neighborhood would occur via a north/south arterial, which would run west from Hutchison Drive in the vicinity of its exit from SR 113 and then turn north toward Russell Boulevard. The north-south arterial would not connect with Russell Boulevard. However, there will be at the NMP proposes two connections for emergency vehicles only, as well as improved bicycle and pedestrian access, at Eisenhower and at Arthur. These connections would have signals that could be activated by emergency vehicle drivers. ~~potential for a connection to Russell Boulevard is also evaluated in this EIR (refer to Section 2.4.14, below).~~

Section 2.3.6.3, Bicycles and Pedestrians, has been revised to explain how bicycle and pedestrian access to Russell Boulevard would be accommodated in the NMP.

Bicycle/pedestrian pathways would provide an off-street travel network to connect all major public and community open space system elements; the Mixed-Use Center, the CEC, the elementary school, and residential buildings; and Transit Green facilities. Bicycle/pedestrian pathways would also connect to existing open space amenities and bicycle trails and facilities ~~both on campus and in the local community. Two~~ One continuous routes with a bicycle/pedestrian undercrossings, one at the northeastern edge of the Transit Green and a second at the Russell Boulevard entryway, would be provided for efficient access to NMP recreation resources and the central campus. In addition, the NMP proposes two bicycle/pedestrian connections to the local community at Russell Boulevard, including one at Eisenhower and one at Arthur. These connections would include special signals for bicycle and police crossings. Bicycle/pedestrian pathways would be a minimum of 10 feet wide to accommodate both bicyclists and pedestrians.

More detail on the revisions to the plan for student parking are explained in Section 2.3.6.4, Parking.

- Parking would be provided at a rate of 3 spaces per 4 beds in student housing projects, onsite in surface parking lots, parking tucked under housing, or parking structures. If parking demand exceeds this supply, then overflow parking will be provided near the recreation fields area to prevent parking pressure on university and City neighborhoods to the north.

On the basis of new data provided by the DJUSD, minor changes were made in school capacity numbers provided in Section 2.3.8.3, Schools and Libraries.

The DJUSD currently operates nine elementary schools (K-6), two junior high schools (grades 7 through 9), two high schools (grades 10 through 12) and one K-12 independent study school, with a total district enrollment of ~~8,957~~8,677 (Jones & Stokes 2000, ~~DJUSD 2002~~DJUSD 2001, DJUSD 2003). UC Davis would provide a new DJUSD elementary school with K through 6 elementary education in the Neighborhood. The Neighborhood elementary school would accommodate approximately 200 children, grades K through 6, with faculty and staff of about 20. For middle and high school services, the students generated by the Neighborhood would attend DJUSD schools in Davis. The Neighborhood would include the CEC with a high school component serving ~~up to 250-80 to 200~~ high school students in the DJUSD, which would offset the Neighborhood's demand for high school facilities and would provide additional capacity to compensate for the NMP's demand for junior high facilities in the City of Davis.

The same data revisions were provided in analysis of Public Services impacts in Section 2.14.12, including in the discussion of NMP Impact 2.4-29, as shown below. These changes do not alter the significance or the severity of this impact.

As shown in Table 4.12-4 of Volume II of this EIR (revised), the DJUSD's existing schools, its new junior high school that is currently under construction, and the DJUSD school facilities proposed as part of the Neighborhood would provide adequate capacity to serve ~~from 10,513 to 10,633~~approximately 9,522 K through 12 students by 2015-16. This capacity, as well as the capacities at each school level, would adequately accommodate existing DJUSD enrollment levels plus enrollment generated by the proposed Neighborhood.

Text was added to Section 2.3.10.11, Domestic Water/Fire Water, consistent with the changes made to the LRDP Utilities baseline section, Volume II, Section 4.15, which are described earlier in this section of the Final EIR. The same numerical corrections were made to Table 2-7. These revisions do not alter the significance or severity of any impact.

The Neighborhood at build-out would produce a peak-hour demand of about 946 gallons per minute (gpm) of water for domestic uses (Ove Arup and Partners 2003). Demand for water for fire protection is based on California Fire Code 1998 and gross square feet of development by building type. Based on these data, and assuming credits are applied for installation of automatic sprinkler systems, ~~residential fire flow demand would be 1,750 gpm, and nonresidential~~the neighborhood's peak fire flow demand (Elementary School, Mixed Use Housing Center, CEC, etc.) would be 2,875 gpm (Ove Arup and Partners 2003). Therefore, the total peak domestic fire water/demand for the NMP would be approximately 3,821 gpm.

The following information was added to Section 2.4.2, Agriculture, to provide more detail on agricultural relocations associated with the NMP. These revisions do not alter the significance or severity of any impact.

Section 4.2 of Volume I presents the environmental setting for the entire campus, including the site of the proposed project. The proposed project area, in the northeastern quadrant of the west campus, consists of prime farmland and is currently used for teaching and research fields, but is proposed for redesignation for a variety of non-agricultural land uses under the campus' 2003 LRDP to accommodate the uses proposed by the NMP. Agricultural research activities currently located on the NMP site (with the exception of the Heidrick Western Center for Agricultural Equipment, which would continue to operate at its present location) would be relocated to prime farmland areas currently used for forage production on campus. Forage production would either be moved off site or would be reduced, with forage for campus livestock supplied commercially.

Additions were made in Section 2.4.3, Air Quality, to the explanatory text following NMP Impact 2.4-5 to further explain why the residual impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Because these emissions are associated with vehicular and area sources, implementation of LRDP Mitigations 4.3-1 (a) and (b) would reduce the severity of this impact but the remaining project-specific NMP emissions would still exceed the significance thresholds. Because the main sources of NMP emissions are area and vehicular sources, mitigation measures to control emissions from these sources, such as reduced use of automobiles or use of alternative fuels, involve change in human behavior and cooperation from NMP residents, and the University is hopeful but cannot guarantee that all individuals will fully cooperate to help minimize emissions. For these reasons, and the impact would be significant and unavoidable.

Text was added to the introduction to Section 2.4.4, Biological Resources, to explain design adjustments made to the NMP subsequent to the issuance of the Draft EIR. In addition to the disfavoring of the option to include a vehicle access to Russell Boulevard, which would eliminate a previously identified potential impact to Specimen trees along Russell Boulevard, adjustments were made in the location of habitat/drainage ponds in the same vicinity, to ensure that tree roots are not damaged by inundation.

The trees along Russell Boulevard are outside of the Neighborhood site and would not be affected by the proposed NMP development. A tree protection zone along the northern edge of the habitat/drainage ponds adjacent to Russell Boulevard is included in the NMP design, to protect the tree roots from potential construction and inundation effects. However, they could be affected by construction of a road connection between the Neighborhood and Russell Boulevard. Mitigation measures are included below to address the potential impact to Russell Boulevard walnut trees. The greenbelt along Russell Road has been expanded since the earlier versions of the project, to provide an aesthetic buffer, and to accommodate wildlife and drainage. Emergency vehicular/pedestrian/bicycle access points in this area will not require the removal of any trees. The project does not include a regular vehicular connection from the Neighborhood to Russell Boulevard.

Changes to NMP Impact 2.4-13 recognize the same revision of the proposed NMP.

NMP Impact 2.4-13: ~~Development under the NMP could~~ would not result in the removal of trees recognized to meet the campus' standards for Important trees, including Specimen trees.

Significance: ~~Potentially significant~~ No Impact

LRDP Mitigation: ~~Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.4-11.~~ None required

While there are no trees on the NMP site, there is a row of mature walnut trees along Russell Boulevard. These are outside the project site, but could be affected by the construction of a connection between the project and Russell Road. The trees as a group, and most individuals in the group, are not heritage trees, but are considered to meet the campus' criteria for specimen trees. If the final project design includes a connection to Russell Boulevard that potentially would affect a few of these trees, the campus will design the connection to avoid and preserve all such trees to the extent feasible. Consistent with LRDP Mitigation 4.4-11, if any specimen trees must be removed, the tree would be relocated if feasible or replaced with another walnut tree to be planted in the near vicinity. The implementation of this measure would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. There are no important or specimen trees on the proposed NMP site. The large California black walnut trees along Russell Boulevard are adjacent to the site and would not be affected by the construction or operation of the neighborhood including the pedestrian, bicycle, emergency vehicle access at Eisenhower Street which would be located at an existing gap in the tree line. In addition, the NMP includes guidelines to protect these trees.

The fact that the Russell Boulevard walnut trees would not be affected by the NMP is also noted in revised text in Section 2.4.5, Cultural Resources.

Text in Section 2.4.6, Geology, Soils and Seismicity, was revised as noted below. The presence of sinkholes on the NMP site does not result in any new impact or changes in the changes in the severity or significance of impact.

The geology and soils of the NMP area share the typical characteristics of the campus overall. Soils are alluvial and very deep, with moderate shrink-swell capacity. The potential for erosion is slight because of the level topography. There are no natural watercourses on the project site, and no rock outcrops. Sinkholes have been reported on the NMP site (Klippert 2003). The potential hazards associated with such sinkholes are adequately addressed on page 4.6-10 of Volume 1 of the Draft EIR.

Text also was added to Geology Section 2.4.6.2 to further explain why LRDP impacts related to soils and seismicity are less than significant.

Section 4.6 (Volume I) concluded that potential impacts related to unstable and expansive soils were less than significant and did not require mitigation, because of building codes, regulations and best management practices (BMPs) already in place (LRDP Impacts 4.6-2 and 4.6-3). Compliance with existing procedures and regulations will ensure that impact potential is less than significant. Geotechnical investigations that address the potential for ground failure are routinely performed for every applicable project. The geotechnical investigations identify appropriate soil compaction requirements for buildings, infrastructure, and site safety. The design and construction of the neighborhood would also be in compliance with the CBC. Standard design and construction practices would be sufficient to ensure that any potential for sinkholes is eliminated by proper excavation and compaction practices. Compliance with existing procedures and regulations will ensure that impact potential is less than significant.

In Section 2.4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, NMP Mitigation 2.4-17(a) was eliminated and Mitigation 2.4-17(b) was revised to recognize that a preliminary Site Assessment (required by NMP Mitigation 2.4-17(a)) has already been conducted by the campus, and to specify procedures through which the campus would ensure that any needed remediation would be identified and conducted prior to any specific development that would be affected. Results of the Preliminary Site Assessment are also reported in the explanatory text that follows the impact assessment. There would be no change in the significance or the severity of the impact.

NMP Impact 2.4-17: Implementation of the NMP could expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated soil or groundwater.

Significance: Potentially significant

NMP Mitigation 2.4-17(a): ~~The campus shall require the developer of the NMP to perform a due diligence investigation that includes a review of past and current uses of the site for activities that may have involved hazardous materials use or hazardous waste disposal.~~

NMP Mitigation 2.4-17(b): ~~If the review identifies activities or practices that may have resulted in releases of hazardous materials to the soil or groundwater, the campus or developer shall~~ perform the soil sampling recommended in the Preliminary Site Assessment for the Neighborhood and shall conduct additional investigation and remediation as appropriate.

Residual significance: Less than significant

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

The proposed NMP site is not on the list of campus sites with known contamination. In addition, in September 2003, the UC Davis Environmental Health and Safety (EH&S) Office performed a Phase I A Preliminary Site Assessment of the proposed Neighborhood site as part of the due diligence process and to identify any potential site contamination issues that might impact the project (Kermoyan 2003). The investigation covered the entire project site. The survey included site observations, aerial photo analysis, review of departmental land records, and interviews of campus personnel.

The proposed Neighborhood site has been used intensively for general agricultural purposes since at least the early 1900's. The site is minimally developed and is currently used by the Departments of Agronomy, Foundation Plant Materials, and Agricultural Engineering. In the past, departmental assignments have varied slightly.

Although 100 percent pesticide use reporting was not required until 1990, departments operating the plots kept records prior to 1990 (the earliest records found were dated 1978). These use logs indicate that a wide range of pesticide materials has been applied to the site since 1978. According to University departments, experimental pesticides were very rarely used, if at all, on the subject site. The land was used only for crop experiments, with chemicals used for crop maintenance purposes. Typically, work with experimental pesticides occurs in more controlled laboratory or greenhouse settings on campus.

Typical degradation half-lives of the substances applied to the site ranged from 10 to 90 days. There was one record of a Diquat application adjacent to the western site boundary in 1990. Diquat has a half-life of 1,000 days. Using a standard of 12 half-lives to approximate zero, this would equate to approximately 33 years for the material to completely dissipate. By comparison, DDT has a half-life of 2,000 days (66 years). More persistent type chemicals could have been used prior to 1978, with half-lives ranging from 350-2,000 days (12-66 years).

Information on historical fertilizer use by the University also dates back to no earlier than 1978, although records are less detailed than for the pesticides. Some fertilizers used on the site may have contained heavy metals as a by-product of their manufacturing process. Unlike most pesticides, any metals would have undergone little biodegradation and instead would have accumulated in the soil since application.

Grain silos located in the southeast corner of the site previously stored fertilizers and pesticides. In July 1995, the campus EH&S coordinated a chemical cleanup of the west campus, including the silos. During this event, materials within the silos were removed under a hazardous waste manifest. Approximately 6,000 pounds of materials were removed from the silos.

The Preliminary Site Assessment recommends soil sampling and analysis of the entire site for pesticides and heavy metals prior to development. In addition, the assessment recommends additional samples within and outside the silos for pesticides, heavy metals, and arsenic. Sampling results would be evaluated and compared, if needed, to regulatory levels consistent with the future intended uses of the site. This testing would be completed prior to any development in the subject area. Remediation to accommodate the planned uses will occur prior to development.

As a condition of financing large projects such as the NMP development, lenders typically require that developers conduct "due diligence" investigations to evaluate the potential that past or current site activities or practices could have resulted in releases of hazardous materials to the soil or groundwater. Therefore, while it is unlikely that contaminated soils or groundwater would be encountered during construction of the proposed project, to further minimize the risk that unexpected contamination could be encountered on the site, implementation of NMP Mitigation 2.4-17(a) and (b) shall be required.

Revisions to NMP Impact 2.4-18 and its explanatory text were made, consistent with the revisions described above with respect to changes to Section 4.7 (Hazards), Volume I.

NMP Impact 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 on recreation fields that could result in a glare hazard for aircraft.

Significance: Potentially significant

LRDP Mitigation: Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.7-15(a-c) and 4.7-15(b).

Residual Significance: Less than significant

To address this impact, the campus will implement LRDP Mitigation 4.7-15(a), which would alter the flight patterns at the University Airport from a left hand approach to a right hand approach. The campus will also implement LRDP Mitigation 4.7-15(c), which requires the campus or a developer acting on behalf of the campus to include disclosure statements in marketing materials for the NMP informing potential owners of property in the NMP of the presence of the University Airport. With this change, the hazard would be eliminated and the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

In addition, night lighting on recreation fields in the NMP could result in upward glare, which could pose a hazard for aircraft in the vicinity of University Airport. The campus will implement LRDP Mitigation 4.7-15(b) to ensure that lighting is appropriately directed, and will check lighting from the air after it is installed and make needed adjustments to ensure upward glare would not pose a hazard to aircraft operations.

NMP Impact 2.4-25 was revised as the result of more detailed noise analysis and in relation to the disfavoring of the option to provide a direct vehicular connection between the NMP and Russell Boulevard. This project revision is explained in Section 4.10 (Noise) and Section 4.14 (Traffic) of Volume II of the Final EIR, and noted in the Volume II revisions, above. As a result of the new analysis, it is concluded that the impact is less than significant prior to mitigation. Revised discussion and data tables with tracked changes are provided below.

NMP Impact 2.4-25: 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.

Significance: Significant

LRDP Mitigation: Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.10-2(a, b ~~and da-b~~).

Residual Significance: Significant and unavoidable

The project would generate 24,260 daily trips between the new Neighborhood and the campus and the City of Davis. ~~If no connection is provided between the Neighborhood and Russell Boulevard, traffic volumes on Russell Boulevard would be somewhat lower as compared to volumes if such a connection is provided.~~ Noise levels were modeled for representative noise-sensitive land uses as shown in Table 2-10. For the Existing case, the 65 dBA CNEL standard of significance for traffic noise is projected to be equaled or exceeded at 6 of the 26 modeled receivers. Of these, several (such as Modeled Receivers 10 and 23) do not currently have noise-sensitive land uses but may be noise-sensitive with implementation of the project. However, noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to Russell Boulevard west of Arlington Boulevard, between SR 113 and La Rue Road/Anderson Road, and west of La Rue Road currently have noise levels at or above 65 dBA CNEL. Also, noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to La Rue Road north of Hutchison Drive currently experience noise levels of 66 dBA CNEL.

~~For the Existing plus NMP with a Russell Boulevard Connection scenario, the significance standard would be equaled or exceeded at 10 of the 26 receivers as shown in Table 2-7. Noise levels along Russell Boulevard west of Arlington Boulevard, between SR 113 and La Rue Road/~~

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

**Table 2-10
NMP Traffic Noise Impact Analysis Results**

Modeled Receiver Number	Representative Area	Calculated Existing CNEL (dBA)	Existing plus NMP Noise Levels (With Russell Blvd. Connection/Without Russell Blvd. Connection)			
			Calculated CNEL (dBA)	Change compared with Existing (dB(A))	Does it cause an exceedance of the criterion level?	Would there be a substantial increase?
1	50 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, west of Arlington Boulevard.	65	67 /66	2 /1	Yes/Yes <u>Yes</u>	No /No
2	100 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard., west of Arlington Boulevard.	59	61 /61	2 /2	No /No	No /No
3	200 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, west of Arlington Boulevard.	56	58 /57	2 /1	No /No	No /No
4	50 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, between Arlington Boulevard and Arthur Street, behind existing soundwall.	60	61 /61	1 /1	No /No	No /No
5	100 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, between Arlington Boulevard and Arthur Street, behind existing soundwall.	57	59 /58	2 /1	No /No	No /No
6	200 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, between Arlington Boulevard and Arthur Street, behind existing soundwall.	56	57 /56	1 /0	No /No	No /No
7	50 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, between Arthur Street and La Rue/Anderson Road.	70	70 /70	0 /0	Yes/Yes <u>No</u>	No /No
8	100 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, between Arthur Street and La Rue/Anderson Road.	62	63 /62	1 /0	No /No	No /No
9	200 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, between Arthur Street and La Rue/Anderson Road.	61	61 /61	0 /0	No /No	No /No
10	50 feet from top-of-slope (TOS), west of SR 113, south of Russell Boulevard.	65	65 /65	0 /0	Yes/Yes <u>No</u>	n/a / n/a
11	100 feet from TOS, west of SR 113, south of Russell Boulevard.	62	62 /62	0 /0	No /No	n/a / n/a
12	200 feet from TOS, west of SR 113, south of Russell Boulevard.	60	60 /60	0 /0	No /No	n/a / n/a
13	50 feet from centerline of Hutchison Drive, west of SR 113.	62	69 /70	7 /8	Yes/Yes	n/a / n/a
14	50 feet from NMP Main Project Access Road, north of Hutchison Drive.	52	67 /70	15 /18	Yes/Yes	n/a / n/a

Table 2-10
NMP Traffic Noise Impact Analysis Results

Modeled Receiver Number	Representative Area	Calculated Existing CNEL (dBA)	Existing plus NMP Noise Levels (With Russell Blvd. Connection/Without Russell Blvd. Connection)			
			Calculated CNEL (dBA)	Change compared with Existing (dB(A))	Does it cause an exceedance of the criterion level?	Would there be a substantial increase?
15	50 feet from NMP Main Project Access Road, south of Russell Boulevard.	57	67 /58	10 /1	No Yes/Yes	n/a / n/a
16	100 feet from centerline of La Rue Road, north of Hutchison Drive.	66	68 /68	2 /2	No Yes/Yes	No/No
17	100 feet from centerline of La Rue Road, south of Hutchison Drive.	63	64 /64	1 /1	No/No	n/a / n/a
18	50 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, east of La Rue/Anderson Road.	71	72 /72	1 /1	No Yes/Yes	No/No
19	100 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, east of La Rue/Anderson Road.	63	64 /64	1 /1	No/No	No/No
20	200 feet from centerline of Russell Boulevard, east of La Rue/Anderson Road.	62	62 /62	0 /0	No/No	No/No
23	50 feet from TOS, west of SR 113, north of Hutchison Drive.	65	65 /65	0 /0	No Yes/Yes	n/a / n/a
24	100 feet from TOS, west of SR 113, north of Hutchison Drive.	62	62 /62	0 /0	No/No	n/a / n/a
25	200 feet from TOS, west of SR 113, north of Hutchison Drive.	58	59 /59	1 /1	No/No	n/a / n/a
26	75 feet from Hutchison Drive between SR 113 and La Rue Road.	64	65 /66	1 /2	Yes /Yes	No/No

n/a = not applicable because there are no existing noise sensitive uses at this site.

~~Anderson Road and west of La Rue Road would exceed 65 dBA CNEL. Similarly, noise sensitive land uses adjacent to La Rue Road north of Hutchison Drive would have noise levels of approximately 68 dBA CNEL at a distance of 100 feet from the centerline. Future noise sensitive land uses adjacent to Hutchison Drive both east and west of SR 113 and those adjacent to SR 113 are predicted to have noise levels exceeding the 65 dBA significance standard.~~

~~For the Existing plus NMP without a Russell Boulevard Connection scenario, the significance standard would be equaled or exceeded at 10 project-related noise would cause an exceedance of the criterion level at four of the 26 receptors. All locations except one are on campus. The changes in noise levels would be very similar to the NMP with Russell Boulevard connection. Under the NMP without a Russell Boulevard connection scenario, traffic volumes and corresponding noise levels are expected to be slightly lower along Russell Boulevard in the vicinity of the NMP and slightly higher along Hutchison Boulevard. However, the differences in noise levels between the two scenarios is small (between 0 and 1 decibel). No substantial increases (compared to the Existing case) would occur at the modeled receptors representing existing noise-sensitive uses. Noise level increases from the proposed project without access from Russell Boulevard would~~

~~range from 0 dBA CNEL (adjacent to SR--113) to as much as 18 dBA CNEL (adjacent to the future NMP Project Main Access Road, north of Hutchison Drive). LRDP Impact 4.10-2 discusses the potential mitigation measure of constructing sound walls for increased roadway noise and determines that such a measure would not be feasible. For the projected impacts identified solely from the NMP analysis, the same mitigation measure is identified, but as identified in the 2003 LRDP analysis, Section 4.10 Volume II of this EIR, the mitigation measure would not be feasible. The potential impacts are therefore considered significant and unavoidable. Although the increases at two locations would be considered substantial, there are currently no receptors at these locations. Therefore there would be no significant impacts at these locations. To avoid noise impacts to existing receptors along Russell Boulevard and future sensitive receptors on the NMP site that may be developed at or near these locations, the campus shall implement LRDP Mitigation 4.10-2(a-b).~~

As described in Section 4.14 of Volume II, and in the revisions to that section, above, a number of text revisions were made as a result of the disfavoring of the option for a direct vehicular connection between the NMP and Russell Boulevard. These same changes are reflected in Volume III Section 2.4.14 (Traffic, Circulation, and Parking). Substantive changes in this section are shown below, by subheading.

Analytical Method. The analysis of impacts of the NMP is tiered from the analysis presented in Section 4.14. Analytical methods used to analyze impacts are essentially the same as outlined in Section 4.14. Specifically, traffic counts under existing conditions at intersections that likely would be used by project traffic were compared with projected LOS at the same intersections with the addition of trips generated by the project. ~~The proposed project is analyzed with pedestrian-bicycle-emergency vehicle access from Russell Boulevard to the neighborhood at Arthur and at Eisenhower Avenues. The proposed NMP is analyzed with and without a roadway connection to Russell Boulevard. The roadway connecting the NMP at Russell Boulevard would be located between Eisenhower Street and Arthur Street. With the NMP roadway connection to Russell Boulevard, vehicles traveling to and from the NMP would be able to utilize Russell Boulevard or Hutchison Drive, and without the connection to Russell Boulevard all vehicles would travel through the main NMP entrance on Hutchison Drive or travel through one of the three minor connections to the NMP. There would be direct vehicular access to Russell Boulevard for emergency vehicles only.~~

Trip Distribution. The trip distribution for the NMP was developed primarily with the UC Davis & City of Davis Travel Demand Forecasting (TDF) Model, calibrated and validated to 2002 conditions. Complete documentation of the model development effort and validation results are contained in *Davis Travel Demand Model Development Report*, Fehr & Peers Associates March 2003, available from the UC Davis Office of Resource Management and Planning. The Davis TDF model was run ~~with and without the NMP (for both access scenarios)~~ to determine the expected distribution of NMP trips. Additional refinement in the project trip distribution was based on existing travel patterns and complementary land uses (e.g., shopping centers) in the project vicinity.

~~**With Russell Boulevard Connection.** Based on the model referenced above, approximately 40 percent of the vehicle trips generated by the NMP are expected to use the Russell Boulevard access and 60 percent of vehicle trips are expected to use Hutchison Drive. A greater percentage of vehicle trips were distributed to major arterials (e.g., Russell Boulevard towards downtown Davis) and collectors with shopping centers (e.g., Arlington Boulevard) than to local streets (e.g., Eisenhower Street). SR 113 is the main travel route between the project site and major destinations throughout Davis and to I 80 and consequently, is expected to carry 35 percent of the NMP vehicle trips. The central core of the campus is expected to be the destination of only 4 percent of NMP vehicle trips. Although NMP residents would be able to buy parking permits on campus only by exception, some drop off and short term parking trips are expected. Figure 2-8 shows NMP vehicle trip distribution with the Russell Boulevard connection.~~

~~Without Russell Boulevard Connection.~~ Although all vehicle trips generated by the NMP would use Hutchison Drive under this scenario, the overall trip distribution would be expected to remain the same as in the first scenario except as discussed below.

- ~~□ A higher percentage of vehicles would use SR 113 to travel to and from the north (18 percent) than in the “With Russell Boulevard Connection” scenario.~~
- ~~□ 8 percent of vehicles would shift from Arlington Boulevard, Eisenhower Street, and Arthur Street onto SR 113 relative to the first scenario, to travel to and from the north.~~

These exceptions are based on the assumption that once vehicles are on SR 113, they may be more inclined to stay on the freeway (e.g., to travel to retail uses on Covell Boulevard) instead of traveling on local roadways. Figure 2-9 displays the NMP’s vehicle trip distribution without the Russell Boulevard connection. Figure 2-8 displays the NMP’s vehicle-trip distribution. As shown, a greater percentage of trips were distributed to major arterials (e.g., Russell Boulevard towards Downtown Davis) and collectors with shopping centers (e.g., Anderson Road) than to local streets (e.g., Eisenhower Street). SR 113 is the major travel route between the project site and major destinations throughout Davis and to I-80 and consequently, is expected to carry approximately 43 percent to the NMP vehicle-trips. The central core of the campus is expected to be the destination of only 4 percent of NMP vehicle-trips. Although NMP residents would be able to buy parking permits on campus only by exception, some drop-off and short-term parking trips are expected.

Vehicle-trips were assigned to the study intersections using the expected trip distribution discussed above, to determine “existing plus project” conditions. Figures 2-10 and 2-11 display 2-9 displays the resulting peak hour traffic volumes at each study intersection with and without the Russell Boulevard connection.

Traffic Operations. This section describes intersection and freeway facilities traffic operations under “existing plus project” conditions. Intersection operations for the “With Russell Boulevard Connection” and “Without Russell Boulevard Connection” scenarios are presented in Tables 2-13 and 2-14 Table 2-14, respectively.

**Table 2-13
Intersection Operations—Existing Plus Project Conditions
With Russell Boulevard Connection**

Location	Traffic Control ^a	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Hutchison Drive/SB SR 113 Ramps	TWSC ^b	>50.0/>50.0	F/F	3.7/>50.0	A/F
2. Hutchison Drive/NB SR 113 Ramps	TWSC	>50.0/>50.0	F/F	>50.0/>50.0	F/F
3. Hutchison Drive/Health Sciences Drive	TWSC	3.7/>50.0	A/F	>50.0/>50.0	F/F
4. Hutchison Drive/La Rue Road	Signal	48.5	D	>80.0	F
5. Russell Boulevard/Arlington Boulevard	TWSC	2.9/28.6	A/D	5.2/>50.0	A/F
6. Russell Boulevard/Eisenhower Street	TWSC	2.4/33.8	A/D	2.7/>50.0	A/F
7. Russell Boulevard/Arthur Street	Signal	13.8	B	17.6	B
8. Russell Boulevard/SB SR 113 Ramps	Signal	15.6	B	6.8	A
9. Russell Boulevard/NB SR 113 Ramps	Signal	10.8	B	25.9	C
10. Russell Boulevard/Sycamore Lane	Signal	14.5	B	20.0	C
11. Russell Boulevard/La Rue Road	Signal	29.3	C	29.7	C
12. Hutchison Drive/Project Access 1	TWSC	0.2/10.2	A/B	0.5/10.0	A/A
13. Hutchison Drive/Project Access 2	TWSC	0.5/10.7	A/B	1.2/10.7	A/B
14. Hutchison Drive/Main Project Access	Roundabout ^c	0.35/0.42	-	0.60/0.72	-
15. Hutchison Drive/Project Access 3	TWSC	0.1/16.6	A/C	0.3/37.2	A/E
16. Russell Boulevard/Main NMP Access	TWSC	5.7/>50.0	A/F	>50.0/>50.0	F/F

Notes:

- a. TWSC = Two-way stop controlled intersection.
 - b. Results for signalized and unsignalized intersections shown in average overall intersection delay & LOS / delay & LOS for critical movement.
 - c. Results for roundabouts shown as volume to capacity ratio for high capacity / low capacity roundabout. Volume to capacity ratios under 1.00 indicate a roundabout operating below capacity.
- Shading indicates project impact.
 Source: Fehr & Peers Associates 2003.

**Table 2-14
 Intersection Operations – Existing Plus Project Conditions
 Without Russell Boulevard Connection**

Location	Traffic Control ^a	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
		Delay	LOS	Delay	LOS
1. Hutchison Drive/SB SR 113 Ramps	TWSC ^b	>50.0/>50.0	F/F	44.0/>50.0	E/F
2. Hutchison Drive/NB SR 113 Ramps	TWSC	>50.0/>50.0	F/F	>50.0/>50.0	F/F
3. Hutchison Drive/Health Sciences Drive	TWSC	4.3/>50.0	A/F	>50.0/>50.0	F/F
4. Hutchison Drive/La Rue Road	Signal	57.7	E	>80.0	F
5. Russell Boulevard/Arlington Boulevard	TWSC	2.9/25.9	A/D	4.9/>50.0	A/F
6. Russell Boulevard/Eisenhower Street	TWSC Signal	2.0/28.37	A/DA	1.4/34.57	A/DA
7. Russell Boulevard/Arthur Street	Signal	11.1	B	12.3	B
8. Russell Boulevard/SB SR 113 Ramps	Signal	17.8	B	5.8	A
9. Russell Boulevard/NB SR 113 Ramps	Signal	11.9	B	33.7	C
10. Russell Boulevard/Sycamore Lane	Signal	14.2	B	20.2	C
11. Russell Boulevard/La Rue Road	Signal	25.7	C	31.5	C
12. Hutchison Drive/Project Access 1	TWSC	0.4/10.5 1.0/11.2	A/B	0.9/10.5 2.3/12.0	A/B
13. Hutchison Drive/Project Access 2	TWSC	0.7/11.0	A/B	1.7/11.6	A/B
14 13. Hutchison Drive/Main Project Access	Roundabout ^c	0.51/0.61	-	0.95/1.14	-
15 14. Hutchison Drive/Project Access 3	TWSC	0.2/25.5	A/D	1.6/>50.0	A/F

Notes:

- a. Results for signalized and unsignalized intersections shown in average overall intersection delay & LOS / delay & LOS for critical movement.
 - b. TWSC = Two-way stop controlled intersection.
 - c. Results for roundabouts shown as volume-to-capacity ratio for high capacity / low capacity roundabout. Volume-to-capacity ratios under 1.00 indicate a roundabout operating below capacity.
- Shading indicates project impact.
 Source: Fehr & Peers Associates 2003a and 2003b.

As shown in ~~Tables 2-13 and 2-14~~Table 2-14, most study intersections are expected to operate at acceptable levels under existing plus project conditions ~~with and without the Russell Boulevard connection~~. The locations listed below would not operate at acceptable levels under this scenario.

~~With Russell Boulevard Connection~~

- ~~□ Hutchison Drive/Southbound SR 113 Ramps (LOS F in the AM peak hour)~~
- ~~□ Hutchison Drive/Northbound SR 113 Ramps (LOS F in the AM and PM peak hours)~~
- ~~□ Hutchison Drive/Health Sciences Drive (LOS F in the PM peak hour)~~
- ~~□ Hutchison Drive/La Rue Road (LOS F in the PM peak hour)~~
- ~~□ Russell Boulevard/Main NMP Access (LOS F in the PM peak hour)~~

~~Without Russell Boulevard Connection~~

- Hutchison Drive/Southbound SR 113 Ramps (LOS F in the AM and PM peak hours)
- Hutchison Drive/Northbound SR 113 Ramps (LOS F in the AM and PM peak hours)
- Hutchison Drive/Health Sciences Drive (LOS F in the PM peak hour)
- Hutchison Drive/La Rue Road (LOS E in the AM peak hour and LOS F in the PM peak hour)
- Hutchison Drive/Main Project Access (over capacity in the PM peak hour)

In addition, the worst-case movement for unsignalized study intersections is expected to operate unacceptably ~~with or without the Russell Boulevard connection~~ at some intersections. Although the unacceptable operations for the worst-case movement at these locations do not exceed UC Davis significance standards for average overall intersection delay, improvements are identified to improve operations for the worst-case movement for use by UC Davis and other jurisdictions in future planning. Measures are proposed that would improve traffic operations for the worst-case movement for the intersections discussed below.

With Russell Boulevard Connection

~~□ Russell Boulevard/Arlington Boulevard~~

~~Deficient operations for the worst case movement (i.e., the left turn movement from Russell Boulevard onto Arlington Boulevard) could be improved by installing a traffic signal at this intersection. However, the peak hour traffic volumes at this intersection do not warrant a traffic signal. In addition, fewer than 20 vehicles make this movement during the AM and PM peak hours. Alternative routes are available for vehicles traveling to the north from Russell Boulevard (e.g., Arthur Street, Eisenhower Street, or Lake Boulevard). Although installing a traffic signal at this intersection would improve operations for the worst case movement, it would degrade operations for vehicles traveling through this intersection, which currently are free flow. Therefore, this improvement is not recommended.~~

~~□ Russell Boulevard/Eisenhower Street~~

~~Deficient operations for the worst case movement (i.e., the left turn movement from Eisenhower Street onto Russell Boulevard) could be improved by providing a two way center left turn lane on Russell Boulevard to provide storage for vehicles turning onto Russell Boulevard to wait for a gap in eastbound traffic. Potential improvements at this intersection are discussed in further detail in the Project Impact and Mitigation section below.~~

~~□ Hutchison Drive/Project Access 3~~

~~Deficient operations for the worst case movement at the Hutchison Drive/Project Access 3 intersection could be improved by prohibiting left turn movements (i.e., only allowing right turn to and from Hutchison Drive). While this improvement would reduce the delay for the worst case movement during the peak hours, it may negatively impact circulation and mobility in the NMP. Therefore, this modification is not recommended.~~

Without Russell Boulevard Connection

- Russell Boulevard/Arlington Boulevard
 - ~~2. As discussed above, d~~Deficient operations for the worst-case movement (i.e., the left-turn movement from Russell Boulevard onto Arlington Boulevard) could be improved by installing traffic signal at this intersection. However, the peak hour traffic volumes at this intersection do not warrant a traffic signal. In addition, fewer than 20 vehicles make this movement during the AM and PM peak hours. Alternative routes are also available for vehicles traveling to the north from Russell Boulevard (e.g., Arthur Street, Eisenhower Street, or Lake Boulevard). Although installing a traffic signal at this intersection would improve operations for the worst-case movement, it would degrade operations for vehicles traveling through this

3.0 CHANGES TO TEXT OF DRAFT EIR

intersection, which currently are free-flow. Therefore, this improvement is not recommended.

- Hutchison Drive/Project Access 3-2 (LOS E in the PM peak hour)
 3. ~~As discussed above, deficient operations for the worst-case movement at the Hutchison Drive/Project Access 3-2 intersection could be improved by prohibiting left-turn movements (i.e., only allowing right-turn to and from Hutchison Drive). While this improvement would improve the delay for the worst-case movement during the peak hours, it may negatively impact circulation and mobility in the NMP. Therefore, this modification is not recommended.~~

Freeway operations. Freeway operations under existing plus project conditions ~~with and without the Russell Boulevard connection~~ are summarized in Table 2-15 ~~Tables 2-15 and 2-16, respectively. As shown in Table 2-15, all study freeway segments would operate at acceptable levels (LOS C or better) under existing plus project conditions with the Russell Boulevard connection. As shown in Table 2-16, all freeway facilities would operate at acceptable levels (LOS C or better) under existing plus project conditions without the Russell Boulevard connection.~~

**Table 2-15
Freeway Operations—Existing Plus Project Conditions
With Russell Boulevard Connection**

Location	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	Density ^a	LOS	Density ^a	LOS
Freeway Mainline Analysis				
Northbound SR 113 at Hutchison Drive (after loop on ramp)	5.8	A	11.0	B
Southbound SR 113 at Russell Boulevard (after loop on ramp)	7.1	A	4.4	A
Southbound SR 113 at Hutchison Drive (after loop on ramp)	7.4	A	6.2	A
Weave Section Analysis				
Northbound SR 113— I-80 to Hutchison Drive	13.1	B	15.3	B
Northbound SR 113— Hutchison Drive to Russell Boulevard	7.8	A	21.7	C
Southbound SR 113— Russell Boulevard to Hutchison Drive	11.7	B	5.2	A
Southbound SR 113— Hutchison Drive to I-80	10.1	B	9.0	A
Ramp Junction Analysis				
Northbound SR 113— Russell Boulevard diagonal on-ramp	11.0	B	19.0	B
Southbound SR 113— Russell Boulevard diagonal off-ramp	20.3	C	13.8	B

Notes:

a. Density reported in passenger cars per mile per lane (pc/mi/ln)

Source: Fehr & Peers Associates 2003.

**Table 2-15
Freeway Operations – Existing Plus Project Conditions
Without Russell Boulevard Connection**

Location	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour	
	Density ^a	LOS	Density ^a	LOS
Freeway Mainline Analysis				
Northbound SR 113 at Hutchison Drive (after loop on-ramp)	6.2	A	11.0	A
Southbound SR 113 at Russell Boulevard (after loop on-ramp)	7.3	A	6.1	A
Southbound SR 113 at Hutchison Drive (after loop on-ramp)	7.5	A	5.2	A
Weave Section Analysis				
Northbound SR 113 – I-80 to Hutchison Drive	13.2	B	14.3	B
Northbound SR 113 – Hutchison Drive to Russell Boulevard	8.1	A	22.8	C
Southbound SR 113 – Russell Boulevard to Hutchison Drive	14.4	B	8.6	A
Southbound SR 113 – Hutchison Drive to I-80	10.1	B	11.1	B
Ramp Junction Analysis				
Northbound SR 113 – Russell Boulevard diagonal on-ramp	11.6	B	20.3	C
Southbound SR 113 – Russell Boulevard diagonal off-ramp	20.8	C	14.6	B

Notes:

a. Density reported in passenger cars per mile per lane (pc/mi/ln).

Source: Fehr & Peers Associates 2003a.

Section 2.4.14.3, describing project-specific traffic impacts and mitigation measures was revised extensively, as shown below, again to reflect to disfavoring of the Russell Boulevard connection.

~~This section outlines the project impacts and associated mitigation measures for the proposed NMP and is separated into two parts. The first part describes project impacts and mitigation measures for the NMP with the Russell Boulevard connection; the second, for the NMP without the Russell Boulevard connection.~~

NMP Impact 2.4-31 was deleted from the analysis in the Final EIR, as shown below.

~~**NMP Impact 2.4 31:** Implementation of the NMP would cause unacceptable intersection LOS under the “With Russell Boulevard” access scenario.~~

~~**Significance:** Significant~~

~~**LRDP Mitigation:** Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.14 1(a-e) and 4.14 2 (a-e).~~

~~**NMP Mitigation 2.4 31:** To maintain adequate levels of service, the campus shall obtain funding for the intersection improvements listed below, as needed, based on occupancy levels and occupancy dates of NMP buildings.~~

~~**Residual Significance:** Less than significant~~

~~Implementation of the NMP would result in approximately 24,260 daily trips, with about 880 trips in the AM peak hour and about 2,000 trips during the PM peak hour. These additional trips would cause the LOS at several intersections to drop below acceptable levels as shown in Table 2-14 and 2-14, above, and would result in a significant impact at these intersections. Mitigation measures to reduce these impacts are identified below.~~

~~In compliance with LRDP Mitigation 4.14 1(a), UC Davis shall continue to actively pursue Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies to reduce reliance on travel to and from campus by private automobile. As described in Section 4.14, Volume II, UC Davis offers a wide~~

~~range of services to faculty and staff to promote campus travel by modes other than single occupancy vehicles. The UC Davis Alternative Transportation Program provides incentives to encourage the use of alternative modes to minimize parking demands and traffic congestion on campus. Reducing peak hour traffic volumes on campus could also be achieved by implementing flexible work schedules and revising class schedules.~~

~~In compliance with LRDP Mitigation 4.14 1(b), UC Davis shall continue to monitor AM and PM peak hour traffic operations at critical intersections on campus and in the campus vicinity at least every 3 years. The monitoring program will identify improvements that are needed to provide acceptable traffic operations and will measure the effects of the implementation of travel demand management programs on campus.~~

~~Consistent with LRDP Mitigation 4.14 1(e) and 4.14 2(e), the campus shall implement the improvements identified below, to provide acceptable operations with the implementation of the NMP.~~

- ~~□ The Hutchison Drive/Southbound SR 113 Ramp intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F during the AM peak hour, resulting in a significant impact. The following measure would improve operations to LOS A during the PM peak hour, reducing the impact to a less than significant level.~~

- ~~~ Install a traffic signal at the Hutchison Drive/Southbound SR 113 Ramp intersection.~~

- ~~~ Any improvement to Caltrans facilities requires the applicant to follow the Caltrans Project Development Process, which includes the completion of a Project Study Report. During this process, additional improvements or an improvement alternative may be selected for implementation.~~

- ~~□ The Hutchison Drive/Northbound SR 113 Ramp intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F during the AM and PM peak hours, resulting in a significant impact. The following measure would improve operations to LOS A during the AM and PM peak hours, reducing the impact to a less than significant level.~~

- ~~~ Install a traffic signal at the Hutchison Drive/Northbound SR 113 Ramp intersection.~~

- ~~~ Any improvement to Caltrans facilities requires the applicant to follow the Caltrans Project Development Process, which includes the completion of a Project Study Report. During this process, additional improvements or an improvement alternative may be selected for implementation.~~

- ~~□ The Hutchison Drive/Health Sciences Drive intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F during the PM peak hour, resulting in a significant impact. The following measure would improve operations to LOS C during the PM peak hour, reducing the impact to a less than significant level.~~

- ~~~ Install a traffic signal at the Hutchison Drive/Health Sciences Drive intersection.~~

- ~~~ The Hutchison Drive/Health Sciences Drive intersection meets the Caltrans peak hour traffic signal warrant for the PM peak hour. This improvement was adopted previously by UC Davis prior to 2005 to accommodate growth within the Health Sciences District.~~

- ~~□ The Hutchison Drive/La Rue Road intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F during the PM peak hour, resulting in a significant impact. The following measure would improve operations to LOS D during the PM peak hour, reducing the impact to a less than significant level.~~

- ~~□ Modify the Hutchison Drive/La Rue Road intersection to provide the following lane configuration and signal phasing.~~

- ~~~ An exclusive left turn lane, a through lane, and an exclusive right turn lane on the westbound approach.~~

- ~ An exclusive left turn lane, a shared left turn/through lane, and a shared through/right turn lane on the northbound approach.
- ~ Protected phasing on the eastbound/westbound approaches.
- ~ An exclusive bicycle and pedestrian phase.
- ~ An exclusive left turn lane, a shared through/left turn lane, a through lane, and an exclusive right turn lane on the southbound approach.
- ~ These improvements are planned by UC Davis with the construction of the West Entry Parking Structure anticipated for completion in 2005 except for the improvements on the southbound approach. The improvements on the southbound approach (i.e., constructing an exclusive right turn lane) are required to provide acceptable (LOS D) operations during the PM peak hour. This would require realigning the sidewalk and bicycle path on the west side of La Rue Road. A 100 foot southbound right turn pocket could be constructed between the intersection stop line and the existing tree on the west side of La Rue north of Hutchison Drive.
- The Russell Boulevard/NMP Main Access intersection would operate unacceptably at LOS F during the PM peak hour, resulting in a significant impact. The following improvement options would improve operations to an acceptable level during the PM peak hour and reduce the impact to a less than significant level.
 - Restrict access to right turns in/out only, to improve operations to LOS E during the PM peak hour, or
 - Install a traffic signal at the Russell Boulevard/NMP Main Access intersection and provide the following lane configurations and signal phasing to improve operations to LOS B during the PM peak hour.
 - ~ An exclusive left turn lane (200 feet) and two through lanes on the westbound approach.
 - ~ An exclusive left turn lane and an exclusive right turn lane on the northbound approach.
 - ~ Protected left turn phasing on the westbound approach, or
 - Alternately, realign the NMP Main Access at Russell Boulevard with Eisenhower Street, install a traffic signal, and provide the following lane configurations to improve operations to LOS C during the PM peak hour.
 - ~ An exclusive left turn lane (100 feet), a through lane, and a shared through/right turn lane on the eastbound approach.
 - ~ An exclusive left turn lane (300 feet), a through lane, and a shared through/right turn lane on the westbound approach.
 - ~ An exclusive left turn lane (175 feet on northbound approach and 75 feet on the southbound approach) and a shared through/right turn lane on the northbound and southbound approaches.

The first measure would improve operations for the NMP access intersection from LOS F to LOS E. However, the northbound right turn movement from the NMP roadway onto Russell Boulevard would continue to operate at LOS F. This measure would limit access to and from the NMP and would add more traffic to the NMP intersections along Hutchison Drive. However, this measure would provide better NMP access than the "Without Russell Boulevard" access scenario.

The second measure would improve operations for the NMP access intersection and would improve operations for the worst case movement at Russell Boulevard/Eisenhower Street. In addition, the second improvement would improve vehicle progression along Russell Boulevard due to the increased distance between signalized intersections. Ideally, signalized intersections have a minimum spacing of 1,000 feet. Realigning the NMP access to Eisenhower Street would

~~provide 1,300 foot spacing between signalized intersections. With the implementation of these measures, the impacts would be less than significant.~~

NMP Impact 2.4-31 (formerly 2.4-32) was revised slightly as shown below.

NMP Impact 2.4-~~32~~31: Implementation of the NMP would cause unacceptable intersection LOS ~~under the “Without Russell Boulevard” access scenario.~~

Significance: Significant

LRDP Mitigation: Implement LRDP Mitigations 4.14-1(a-~~eb~~) and 4.14-2(a-~~e~~).

NMP Mitigation 2.4-~~32~~31: To maintain adequate levels of service, the campus shall obtain funding for the intersection improvements listed below, as needed, based on occupancy levels and occupancy dates of NMP buildings.

Residual Significance: Less than significant

With the small expansion of the student housing area to accommodate more parking, and the addition to design detail of potential parking areas around the recreation fields, Draft EIR project-specific NMP Mitigation 2.4-33 was eliminated because the impact already was reduced to a less-than-significant level by LRDP mitigations.

NMP Impact 2.4-~~33~~32: Implementation of the NMP could create additional parking demand.

Significance: Significant

LRDP Mitigation: Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.14-3 (a and b).

~~**NMP Mitigation 2.4-~~33~~32:** The campus shall manage parking demand to match the number of parking spaces provided in NMP student housing areas.~~

Residual Significance: Less than significant

The proposed parking supply for the NMP land uses other than student housing are expected to meet anticipated demand, as detailed above. Parking standards in the City of Davis would require parking spaces for approximately 66 percent of the NMP population within the development. The Colleges at La Rue apartment complex provides parking for approximately 86 percent of the population and an additional 4 percent of the students are allowed to purchase a campus parking permit, which indicates a potential parking demand of approximately 90 percent at the Colleges at La Rue complex. Unlike the Colleges at La Rue complex, the student housing area in the NMP would be required to charge apartment rents and parking permit fees separately for students. The effect of this policy is to identify a direct cost for parking permits, thereby introducing a financial incentive for students to not bring cars to UC Davis.

In the NMP student housing areas, onsite parking would be provided at a rate of 75 percent of the 3,000 student residents, for a total parking supply of 2,250 parking spaces. If parking demand exceeds this supply, then overflow parking will be provided near the recreation fields to prevent parking pressure on university and City neighborhoods to the north. Additional visitor and resident parking spaces will be provided as on-street parallel parking and is anticipated to be adequate to meet visitor parking needs. The parking data from the parking conditions at the Colleges at La Rue apartment complex indicate that an actual demand of 90 percent of student residents or 2,700 spaces of student parking may be needed for UC Davis student housing areas such as that proposed in the NMP. According to the City of Davis parking standards, approximately 1,980 spaces would be required. The provision of 2,250 parking spaces in the NMP is considered adequate by City standards to meet anticipated demand. However, on the basis of the high demand for parking at the Colleges at La Rue apartment complex, it is possible that there would be a greater than anticipated demand from the NMP student housing.

Additional stipulations were added to NMP Impact 2.4-33 (formerly NMP 2.4-34) to specify recommended measures to reduce potential bicycle/vehicle conflicts as mitigation.

NMP Impact 2.4-~~34~~33: Implementation of the NMP would result in increased conflicts between bicyclists, pedestrians, and motor vehicles, and cause increased congestion and safety problems.

Significance: Significant

LRDP Mitigation: Implement LRDP Mitigation 4.14-5.

NMP Mitigation 2.4-~~34~~33: The campus shall construct the additional bicycle facilities; ~~discussed below.~~

- Construct the bicycle path along the south side of Orchard Park Circle. Bicyclists and vehicles would be separated by the perpendicular parking on the south side of Orchard Park Circle, or
- Construct the bicycle path in the location of the existing perpendicular parking on the south side of Orchard Park Circle and provide a barrier (e.g., a landscaped median) to separate vehicles traveling on Orchard Park Circle from the bicyclists.

Residual Significance: Less than significant

NMP Alternatives Analysis

The text of Section 2.5.2.5, Alternative 3: North-South Orientation Alternative, was revised to indicate that agricultural lands used by six campus departments would be affected by this alternative, rather than seven departments as stated in the Draft EIR.

The land use and planning impact analysis for this alternative, presented in Section 2.5.2.6, was also revised to reflect this correction.

Land Use and Planning. Like the proposed project, the North-South Orientation Alternative would have potentially significant impacts with respect to construction in an aircraft Traffic Pattern Zone, but the impact would be reduced by the greater distance of most of the alternative from the more restrictive Airport Safety Compatibility Zones of the University Airport.

The alternative would result in increased impacts associated with incompatibility with existing or planned land uses. Development of the North-South Orientation Alternative would require relocation of existing uses established on and adjacent to the site by ~~six~~seven campus departments. In addition to the land use issues ~~affecteding the Agronomy Department~~ under the proposed project, the alternative would displace ~~21,000 square feet of support facilities and 3,500 square feet of greenhouse space assigned to the Agronomy and Range Science Department;~~ the Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering's five-year-old Heidrick Western Center for Agricultural Equipment; ~~meteorological and soil research facilities of the Department of Land, Air and Water Resources, which include long term research that could not be relocated in the short term without significant impacts to the research;~~ Vegetable Crops Department research lands and support facilities; ~~stock nurseries and orchards of the self-supporting Foundation Plant Materials Service;~~ facilities ~~and~~ pasture and animal feed lands of the Animal Science Department; and meteorological and soil research fields and facilities of the Department of Land, Air and Water Resources, which include long term research that could not be relocated in the short term without significant impacts to the research. ~~field service support operations in 40,800 square feet of facilities operated by the Agricultural Services Office.~~ While the North-South Orientation Alternative would not develop the LAWR site itself, it would develop land to the east, south and southeast of the research area. Prevailing winds are from the southeast to the southwest, except for

isolated north wind events, so the development to the southeast of the long-term field site would greatly impact meteorological research, necessitating its relocation. These displacement impacts would be additional significant impacts of this alternative because they would represent conflicts with existing land uses. The alternative also indirectly would result in –additional impacts associated with the reestablishment of the displaced facilities at new locations.

DRAFT EIR SECTION 3.0 RESEARCH PARK MASTER PLAN

Under RPMP Impact 3.4-15, the concluding statement on residual significance of the impact was inadvertently omitted from the Draft EIR text. The impact was less than significant after mitigation. This oversight does not change the conclusion that was reached in the impact analysis in the Draft EIR.

No other substantive changes were made in the text of this section, except insofar as LRDP impacts and mitigation measures that were revised are also applicable to the RPMP.

OTHER SECTIONS OF VOLUME III

Minor editorial revisions, but no substantive changes, were made in text, data and tables presented in Section 4.0, Multi-Use Stadium Complex, Section 5.0, Robert Mondavi Institute Project and Section 6.0, Chilled Water Facilities Expansion.