

Responses to Comments  
Received on the Notice of Preparation

## APPENDIX A

### RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION

The Notice of Preparation and Draft Initial Study for the proposed 2003 LRDP were circulated for agency and public review from October 21, 2002 to November 22, 2002. A public scoping meeting was held on November 20, 2002. Comments received during this review are posted online at [www.ormp.ucdavis.edu/environreview/lrdp.html](http://www.ormp.ucdavis.edu/environreview/lrdp.html) and are available for review at the Office of Resource Management and Planning in 376 Mrak Hall on the UC Davis campus. The campus received 13 comment letters from state and local agencies, 25 letters from UC Davis affiliates, 7 letters from organizations, and 53 letters from the general public.

The following summarizes the comments expressed in letters received (organized by topic) and provides brief responses to these comments. In addition, each resource section in the 2003 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) provides a general summary of the relevant comments received and incorporates analyses intended to address these comments.

#### **Planning Process**

**Comment:** Who was involved with the LRDP committee?

**Response:** During the long range planning process, campus planners coordinated with, and have received input from, a variety of on- and off-campus participants, including: campus leadership, campus staff (LRDP Task Force), campus students (ASUCD and Graduate Student Union), and local government planners and officials. Involvement with the general public is described further in Section 3.3 of the Project Description in Volume I of this EIR.

**Comment:** Concern expressed about not being heard during the LRDP's public involvement process.

**Response:** The public involvement process for the 2003 LRDP, as summarized in Section 3.3, Volume I of this EIR, began in June 2001 and included 17 public workshops and numerous campus committee meetings. Public input has extensively informed the proposed 2003 LRDP, including the Neighborhood Master Plan (NMP) proposal.

**Comment:** Thanks expressed for communicating with neighbors.

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment:** Public noticing and City of Davis outreach should be increased.

**Response:** Public involvement during development of the LRDP is described further in Section 3.3 of the Project Description in Volume I. The campus will continue efforts to coordinate with the City and notify the public about the campus' development plans and associated environmental review.

**Comment:** Pleased with planning efforts.

**Response:** Comment noted.

#### **Need and Objectives**

**Comment:** A few comments questioned the need for affordable on-campus housing, and, in particular, stated/asked the following: Sacramento area housing affordability is adequate for UC

Davis faculty. How does the NMP proposal compare to housing offered at other UCs? The cost of housing is high in other University communities. The cost of housing is not really a consideration for faculty. UC Davis affiliates do not need to reside locally. What are the benefits of having a neighborhood consist of UC-affiliates only?

**Response:** As discussed further in Section 2, Neighborhood Master Plan, of Volume III of the EIR, the currently high percentage of the campus population that lives in the City of Davis contributes significantly to the strong sense of community both on campus and locally. As described in this section, City of Davis vacancy rates are low and housing costs are high, which limits the opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to reside in the immediate area. The primary benefits of a University-affiliated neighborhood are the ability to maintain affordability, the physical proximity to a place of school or work (with associated lifestyle, traffic, and air quality benefits), and the ability to provide sense of community due to University connections and relationships. Other UC campuses provide housing to faculty and staff, including UC Irvine and UC Santa Cruz.

**Comment:** Need for faculty/staff housing on campus should consider new housing in the City of Davis and regional communities, and the potential for on-campus student housing to reduce demand for rental properties in the City of Davis.

**Response:** The NMP would provide housing for approximately 13 percent of the faculty/staff population growth under the 2003 LRDP, and the remaining new employees would find housing elsewhere in the City of Davis or in regional communities. Regional housing demand associated with the 2003 LRDP is evaluated further in Section 4.11 Population and Housing (Volume II of the EIR).

**Comment:** All new members of the campus population should be housed on campus.

**Response:** The NMP would offer housing to offset the demand created by the increase in the student population under the 2003 LRDP, and it would provide housing for approximately 13 percent of new faculty and staff. Housing demand associated with the 2003 LRDP is evaluated further in Section 4.11 Population and Housing (Volume II of the EIR).

**Comment:** The campus can and should limit student growth.

**Response:** As described further in Section 1.3, Project Background in Volume I of the EIR, the University of California projected system-wide enrollment growth based on factors from the California Department of Finance's Demographic Research Unit, and it requested that each campus evaluate how it could accommodate a fair share of this enrollment growth. The 2003 UC Davis LRDP documents the campus' proposal for accommodating this growth.

**Comment:** The ratio of new faculty and staff per new students seems high.

**Response:** The increase in the UC Davis faculty and staff population of 4,000 from 2001-02 through 2015-16 is projected based on the anticipated student population increase, assumptions about increased research productivity, and the fact that approximately 1,500 faculty and staff who are included in this growth are associated with projects that have already been approved under the 1994 LRDP but have not yet been constructed.

### **2003 LRDP Project Description and Alternatives**

**Comment:** The 2003 LRDP should address specifics of core campus infill.

**Response:** Figure 3-4 in Section 3, Volume I of the EIR presents the 2003 LRDP Land Use Diagram. As shown in the proposed plan, the core campus would continue to accommodate

## Appendix A

### Responses to Comments

---

primarily high density academic and administrative development, including typically large, multi-story facilities. As discussed in Section 3.8, Volume I of the EIR, the 2003 LRDP would allow for development of 2.5 million assignable square feet of academic and administrative building space on campus from 2001-02 through 2015-16, the majority of which would occur as infill within the central campus' academic core and Health Sciences District. Existing temporary and one-story buildings on campus will be demolished and replaced with higher-rise facilities under the 2003 LRDP. In addition, approximately 2,000 new beds for first-year students are currently under construction or are planned under the 2003 LRDP for the central campus.

**Comment:** The garden walk concept is a good idea.

**Response:** Comment noted. Figure 3-4, the 2003 LRDP Land Use Diagram, depicts existing and proposed Garden Walks, and Section 3.8.4, Formal Open Space, describes this concept further.

**Comment:** Walker Hall should be saved under the 2003 LRDP.

**Response:** As identified in Section 4.6 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity (Volume I), Walker Hall has been identified to be in poor seismic condition, and the campus is currently studying seismic rehabilitation. Rehabilitation would likely involve modification, but not full demolition, of the building. Walker Hall, as identified in Section 4.5, Cultural Resources, of the EIR, is over 50 years old and could be considered a historical resource. In accordance with mitigation measures identified in the EIR, the historical significance of the structure would be thoroughly evaluated prior to any modifications, and if the structure is identified as a historical resource, it will be treated in conformance with cultural resources mitigation measures identified in the EIR.

**Comment:** The Nishi property should be left open.

**Response:** The 2003 LRDP does not propose development on the privately-owned Nishi property.

**Comment:** Concern expressed about development at Russell Ranch.

**Response:** Under the 2003 LRDP, Russell Ranch would not be extensively developed, but would be used primarily for teaching and research fields, a habitat area, campus equestrian center relocation, and dairy relocation. Permanent habitat and agricultural conservation areas would also be established at Russell Ranch under the 2003 LRDP.

**Comment:** The student farm on the central campus should not be developed.

**Response:** The 2003 LRDP does not plan to develop the student farm area.

**Comment:** Why would the dairy move to Russell Ranch?

**Response:** The 2003 LRDP would provide for relocation of the dairy from the core campus to the Russell Ranch to enable the core campus space to be used for higher-density academic and administrative uses and to provide a larger, more modern, and longer-term facility for the dairy operations. Land available at the Russell Ranch would also enable a new dairy complex to co-locate facilities and land for forage crops and waste management into an integrated system.

**Comment:** Long-term agricultural and livestock uses should be moved to Russell Ranch.

**Response:** The 2003 LRDP provides for future relocation of the Equestrian Center and the dairy facility from the central campus to Russell Ranch to free space in the central campus for higher density academic and administrative uses and to provide newer long-term facilities for these operations.

**Comment:** Financial impacts on the City of Davis should be addressed.

**Response:** Section 4.12, Public Services, and Section 4.15, Utilities, of Volume II of this EIR identify physical modifications that could be required to provide adequate City services and utilities through 2015-16 given growth induced in part by the 2003 LRDP. These sections identify mitigation to reduce associated environmental effects to the extent feasible. The CEQA Guidelines do not require an analysis of economic effects except in cases when economic changes may cause physical changes. A separate fiscal analysis is underway and is being developed with input from City and county staff. A draft report will be shared with City and county officials to assure that all financial effects of the proposed Neighborhood development are available for review by local decision makers and the public.

### **NMP Project Description and Alternatives**

**Comment:** Concern was expressed regarding the potential loss of the Heidrick Western Center for Agricultural Equipment as a result of the proposed Neighborhood.

**Response:** The proposed NMP would not remove the Center for Agricultural Equipment. The Center's building would remain, and some outdoor activities would move immediately south across Hutchison Boulevard in coordination with the Department of Land Air and Water Resources.

**Comment:** The Heidrick Western Center for Agricultural Equipment site should be used for the NMP.

**Response:** The proposed NMP would not use the Heidrick Western Center for Agricultural Equipment's building site, but it would use the Center's outdoor grounds, which would be relocated immediately west across Hutchison Drive.

**Comment:** The potential for future expansion of the NMP needs to be addressed.

**Response:** The plans for the neighborhood through 2015-16 are presented and analyzed in Section 2, Volume III of this EIR, and expansion beyond these plans is speculative.

**Comment:** The transit corridor in the Neighborhood should be located closer to the student housing, and the elementary school should be located centrally.

**Response:** As presented in Section 2, Volume III of the EIR, the transit corridor and transit route would be located adjacent to student housing areas. The transit route is located within a 5-minute walk of all housing in the Neighborhood. The elementary school would be located in the northeast corner of the Neighborhood, adjacent to faculty/staff housing, where most school children would live, and on the eastern edge of the site to stay out of the airport flight path, pursuant to Caltrans Aeronautics Division guidelines.

**Comment:** What types of innovative housing would be incorporated into the NMP?

**Response:** As described in Section 2, Volume III, sound environmental design is an important feature of the NMP, including optimization of solar access and natural wind and water flows, on-site environmental systems (such as solar panel technology and drainage swales and ponds for stormwater retention), and water and energy conservation features.

**Comment:** An alternative NMP, oriented north-south, with a buffer to the north and clustered development close to the campus, should be considered.

**Response:** A north-south oriented neighborhood is evaluated in the alternatives analysis presented in Section 2, Volume III of this EIR.

## Appendix A

### Responses to Comments

---

**Comment:** Several comments suggested that housing should be infilled in the core campus. Suggestions for providing space for housing included: move animal facilities and agricultural activities out of the core; replace surface parking lots with multi-story parking; redevelop Toomey Field; redevelop the domes area; replace single-story temporary buildings; and using the south entry area, the proposed stadium site, a site west of Solano Park, a site north of Colleges at La Rue, and academic building sites for housing.

**Response:** An alternative that considers providing housing only within the central campus is evaluated in the alternatives analysis presented in Section 2, Volume III of this EIR.

**Comment:** Several comments supported higher densities and taller buildings to reduce the NMP's footprint and to orient it closer to SR 113.

**Response:** A higher density neighborhood alternative that incorporates taller buildings is evaluated in the alternatives analysis presented in Section 2, Volume III of this EIR.

**Comment:** The NMP has too much community green space.

**Response:** The NMP has three main types of open space, including (1) community open space, such as parks and bikeways, (2) drainage/habitat ponds that serve as open space areas as well as natural drainage areas and buffers to adjacent land uses, and (3) recreation fields, which are oversized for the Neighborhood because they would serve the needs of the entire campus.

**Comment:** Orient the NMP along Hutchison Drive, provide a buffer between housing and Russell Blvd., and move the village center closer to Hutchison and SR 113.

**Response:** As described in Section 2, Volume III, the NMP would be located north of Hutchison Drive and south of Russell Blvd, and the village square would be located near the primary neighborhood entry road off Hutchison Drive in proximity to SR 113. An open space buffer would be provided along Russell Blvd. to provide a low-density transition to other land uses.

**Comment:** Several comments expressed preference for the smaller NMP option that was presented in the Initial Study.

**Response:** The currently proposed NMP is largely the same as the NMP presented in the Initial Study.

**Comment:** The Nishi Parcel should be used for housing.

**Response:** The 2003 LRDP does not propose development for the privately-owned Nishi property. The reasons why this site is not considered are presented in the alternatives analysis in Section 2, Neighborhood Master Plan, in Volume III.

**Comment:** The Neighborhood should be named Campbell Village or Campbell Ranch, and Hutchison Dr. should be changed to Campbell Dr.

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment:** Faculty/staff housing should only be used for recruiting.

**Response:** Faculty/staff housing in the NMP would be available to newly recruited employees, as well as existing employees for retention goals.

**Comment:** Housing needs to be permanently subsidized.

**Response:** As described in the project description section of Section 2, Volume III, affordability is a primary objective of the NMP, and the long-term affordability of NMP housing would be made feasible through the use of long-term ground leases and resale controls on for-sale housing.

**Comment:** A limited equity cooperative model for UC Davis employees in the NMP should be considered.

**Response:** The long-term affordability of NMP housing would likely be made feasible through the use of long-term ground leases and resale controls on for-sale housing. The University is open to other mechanisms as well to assure long-term affordability of housing units; however, the CEQA process is not the proper forum for this type of economic evaluation.

**Comment:** Concern expressed about having a community college facility on campus.

**Response:** The NMP includes a Community Education Center for use by the Los Rios Community College District that would include from 60,000 assignable square feet of building space and would accommodate up to 2,130 full time equivalent community college students. The center would also serve as a joint-use facility for Davis High School and UC Davis classrooms. A significant percentage of classes at the community college center already serves UC Davis students, and will continue to do so.

**Comment:** Community gardens, public art, and gravel driveways should be considered for the NMP.

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment:** The fiscal impacts of the NMP's retail uses on local retailers should be addressed.

**Response:** The mixed-use housing area in the NMP would include approximately 45,000 square feet of ground floor space for office and locally-serving commercial and civic uses that are not anticipated to negatively affect local retailers. The CEQA Guidelines do not require an analysis of economic effects except in cases when economic changes may cause physical changes. There are not expected to be adverse physical changes.

**Comment:** Evaluate making the mixed-use center in the Neighborhood larger.

**Response:** As described further in the Project Description of Section 2, Volume III of the EIR, the proposed NMP's mixed-use housing area would occupy approximately four acres, would consist of a cluster of two- to four-story buildings, and would offer approximately 45,000 square feet of ground floor office and commercial space and approximately 65 apartments. This size would adequately accommodate locally-serving retail and office uses anticipated, and it would provide additional housing space.

**Comment:** The NMP should be phased to respond to housing demand gradually.

**Response:** The NMP would be phased to respond to housing demand. Phases of construction are described further in the project description of Section 2, Volume III.

**Comment:** Concern expressed about proximity of student housing to employee housing.

**Response:** Open space areas, including the transit green area, would act as buffers between student and faculty/staff housing areas.

### **Multi-Use Stadium Complex Project Description and Alternatives**

**Comment:** The stadium restricts future expansion of the Health Sciences District.

**Response:** The 2003 LRDP provides space for expansion of the Health Sciences District within undeveloped areas to the west and east of the district, and within the current UC Davis Equestrian Center site to the south of the District.

## Appendix A

### Responses to Comments

---

**Comment:** A few comments suggested alternate sites for the stadium, including west of SR 113 and south of Hutchison Dr., and in the campus' south entry area.

**Response:** Alternate stadium sites located west of SR 113 and south of Hutchison Blvd., and in the campus' south entry area, are evaluated in the alternatives analysis presented in Section 4, Volume III.

#### **Research Park Master Plan Project Description and Alternatives**

**Comment:** The Research Park Master Plan (RPMP) is a progressive concept.

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment:** The consistency between the RPMP and the old City of Davis/UC Davis Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) should be addressed.

**Response:** The old MOU between the City of Davis and UC Davis was based on the 1989 UC Davis LRDP and the 1987 City of Davis LRDP. Approval of the 1989 LRDP was reversed by a subsequent CEQA lawsuit, and the MOU was not incorporated into the last 1994 LRDP. The City of Davis adopted a new General Plan in 2001 that supercedes the 1987 General Plan. Nevertheless, the City and campus have worked together in the spirit of the MOU, which indicates that "UCD will cooperate with and be sensitive to the City and to the City's General Plan, as enacted on December 26, 1987, and will work together with the City to resolve reasonably the off-campus impacts of the LRDP to the City." There are many elements of the 1989 MOU that have been superceded by subsequent events, but the University has abided by the financial commitments presented in the agreement. Topics of similar interest will be updated in new agreements between the campus and local governments, as necessary.

#### **Aesthetics**

**Comment:** Scenic views should be maintained.

**Response:** Potential impacts on scenic views are fully evaluated in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, in Volume I of the EIR. Consistent with mitigation identified in this section, projects developed under the 2003 LRDP would be designed to maintain scenic views to the extent possible. Design considerations could include establishing open landscaping and deciduous trees along important view corridors.

**Comment:** The campus should use lighting standards to reduce skyglow.

**Response:** Potential impacts associated with day and nighttime lighting are fully evaluated in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, in Volume I of the EIR. Mitigation identified in this section would minimize light pollution, excess site lighting, and upward directed lighting to the extent feasible under the 2003 LRDP.

### Agriculture

**Comment:** Several comments expressed concern about a loss of agricultural lands and identified particular concern about a loss of prime farmland, relationship to the campus' land grant mission, loss of research infrastructure and historical data, and potential loss of additional agricultural land due to adjacency to the NMP.

**Response:** Loss of agricultural lands, loss of prime farmlands, and the effects of other uses on agricultural areas are fully evaluated in Section 4.2, Agricultural Resources, of Volume I of the EIR.

**Comment:** Several comments recommended the campus mitigate for loss of agricultural land, including by providing an agricultural reserve adjacent and west of the NMP and preserving at a 2:1 for lost agricultural land.

**Response:** Section 4.2, Agricultural Resources, of Volume I of the EIR identifies that the campus will mitigate for lost farmland by establishing on agricultural conservation area at Russell Ranch. The campus will conserve farmland at a 1:1 ratio for prime farmland lost to development, and at a 1/3:1 ratio for prime farmland converted to wildlife habitat.

**Comment:** The potential impact on regional agricultural buffers should be evaluated.

**Response:** The 2003 LRDP would develop some agricultural lands on campus, but would not develop off-campus agricultural areas that serve as regional buffers. As presented in Section 4.2, Agricultural Resources, and 4.4, Biological Resources, of Volume I of the EIR, the campus would establish permanent agricultural and habitat conservation areas at the Russell Ranch.

**Comment:** Evaluate conflicts between adjacent agricultural and residential uses.

**Response:** Section 4.2, Agricultural Resources, of Volume I of the EIR evaluates the potential for land use changes under the 2003 LRDP, including new residential uses, to result in conversion of additional farmland to non-agricultural use due to associated conflicts.

### Air Quality

**Comment:** A quantitative assessment of air quality impacts should be performed.

**Response:** Section 4.2, Volume I of this EIR provides a full evaluation of impacts to air quality.

**Comment:** What are the air quality impacts of the relocated dairy?

**Response:** The 2003 LRDP provides for an approximately 20-acre area designated for academic and administrative land use at Russell Ranch that is anticipated to accommodate a relocated dairy facility. If and when the dairy is relocated, potential impacts associated with relocation and potential expansion of the dairy would be evaluated in a detailed environmental review. The future size, exact location, and important operational details of a future relocated dairy are currently unknown, as are details of such a facility's waste treatment system. Therefore, an analysis of air quality impacts associated with the project would be speculative at this time.

**Comment:** Air quality mitigation should consider construction equipment and retrofit of existing facilities.

**Response:** Construction equipment mitigation including retrofit of existing emissions is included in LRDP Mitigation 4.3-3(c).

## Appendix A

### Responses to Comments

---

**Comment:** Air quality impact analysis should address pollution associated with increased electricity use, gas blowers, and air borne pesticides (including effects associated with Fairfield Elementary School located near Russell Ranch). (I-27, UC-15)

**Response:** Impacts of air borne pesticides are addressed in Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of Volume I of this EIR. The 2003 LRDP would relocate the UC Davis Equestrian Center to a Russell Ranch site that borders Fairfield Elementary, providing a buffer between the school and more intense agricultural activities. Air emissions from electricity generation on campus and air emissions from landscaping equipment are included in the air emission projections contained in Section 4.3 (Volume I) of the EIR.

#### **Biological Resources**

**Comment:** Will habitat conservation efforts be coordinated with Solano County, and will they address the Kidwell or Hamel properties?

**Response:** Under the 2003 LRDP, all habitat mitigation efforts would be located at the Russell Ranch, which is in Yolo County but immediately adjacent to the Yolo-Solano county line that follows Putah Creek. These habitat mitigation measures would be coordinated with ongoing habitat conservation planning efforts in both Yolo and Solano counties. In addition, the campus participates in the Lower Putah Creek Coordinating Committee, which includes representatives from both counties and coordinates activities along Putah Creek.

**Comment:** Concern expressed about loss of walnut trees along Russell Blvd.

**Response:** Potential impacts to Walnut Trees along Russell Boulevard are discussed in the biological resources section of Section 2, Volume III of the LRDP EIR.

**Comment:** Support was expressed for habitat mitigation plans.

**Response:** Comment noted. The preparation of a campus Habitat Conservation Plan has been deferred.

**Comment:** Wildlife-friendly landscaping should be incorporated.

**Response:** The 2003 LRDP would improve habitat resources on campus by providing for expansion of the University Arboretum and the UC Davis Putah Creek Riparian Reserve. In addition, mitigation identified in Section 4.4, Biological Resources, Volume I of the EIR, would establish a habitat conservation area at Russell Ranch.

#### **Hazardous Materials**

**Comment:** Concern and opposition was expressed about the potential National Biosafety Laboratory.

**Response:** As discussed further in Section 3, Project Description, of Volume I, the campus submitted a Federal Grant Application to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) for federal authorization and funding to establish a potential National Biosafety Laboratory (NBL). If the campus' application is successful, the campus will fully evaluate the environmental effects of the proposed facility pursuant to state and federal law before consideration of approval. The 2003 LRDP designates the potential NBL site identified in the NIH application for *High Density Academic and Administrative* and *Parking* uses, and this EIR evaluates the environmental implications of developing new academic and administrative facilities and parking on the site. As a part of the overall development that could occur under the 2003 LRDP, this EIR also

discusses the general land use and growth-related environmental effects associated with the potential NBL facility.

**Comment:** Construction sites developed under the LRDP should be evaluated for site and groundwater contamination.

**Response:** Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of Volume I of this EIR fully evaluates the potential for contaminated soil and groundwater to occur under sites that could be developed under the 2003 LRDP. Continuation of current due diligence policy and regulatory compliance would minimize risks associated with exposure to contaminated soil or groundwater.

**Comment:** Concern was expressed about the pesticides used on campus, including at Russell Ranch near the Fairfield Elementary School.

**Response:** As discussed in Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of Volume I of this EIR, UC Davis policy requires departments using pesticides on campus to comply with state and current county requirements. UC Davis policy stipulates that pesticide application by aircraft will be approved only when absolutely necessary, is permitted only west of SR 113 and south of I-80, and must comply with Yolo or Solano County conditions for buffer setbacks. The County Agricultural Commissioners grant site-specific permits for use of restricted pesticides and conduct periodic onsite observations of application sites and field worker safety. Campus personnel who handle or apply restricted pesticides or the supervising applicator must obtain a State Qualified Applicator Certificate. The 2003 LRDP would relocate the UC Davis Equestrian Center to a Russell Ranch site that borders Fairfield Elementary, providing a buffer between the school and more intense agricultural activities. In addition, maintenance of the campus' landscaped areas requires minimal fertilizers (which are applied infrequently to lawn areas), rare use of insecticides, and low levels of herbicides (primarily along roadsides for fire protection).

**Comment:** Concern expressed about the health risks associated with campus research.

**Response:** The risks associated with hazardous materials used on campus under the 2003 LRDP are fully evaluated in Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of Volume I, and toxic air contaminant health risks under the 2003 LRDP are fully evaluated in Section 4.3, Air Quality, in Volume I of this EIR. The campus complies with local, state, and federal laws pertaining to use of hazardous materials.

### **Hydrology/Water Quality**

**Comment:** How will the campus ensure there are no violations from the campus' wastewater treatment plant?

**Response:** Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, of Volume II of this EIR fully evaluates the campus wastewater treatment plant's ability to meet its discharge requirements under the 2003 LRDP. The campus will comply with its Waste Discharge Requirements, will monitor and modify its operations as needed to comply with permit limits, and will apply for a new discharge permit before any expansion of the plant occurs.

**Comment:** Concern was expressed about the quantity and quality of local water supplies.

**Response:** Quantity and quality of water supplies under the 2003 LRDP are fully evaluated in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, of Volume II of this EIR. While overall demand for surface water and shallow/intermediate aquifer water is anticipated to decrease under the 2003 LRDP, demand for water from the deep aquifer is expected to increase. Mitigation measures identified in Section 4.8 would encourage water conservation and efficient water management.

## Appendix A Responses to Comments

---

### Land Use and Planning

**Comment:** A City of Davis Measure J vote should occur for the proposed Neighborhood.

**Response:** The University of California has no control over the implementation of City of Davis ordinances. However, Measure J does not apply to the campus. No environmental effects are expected to result from the presence or absence of a City of Davis vote.

**Comment:** Would the Research Park Master Plan area be annexed to the City of Davis?

**Response:** The University of California does not propose to include the area designated for the Research Park Master Plan in an annexation application.

**Comment:** The potential for the Stadium Complex to physically divide the Health Sciences area should be evaluated.

**Response:** The proposed Multi-Use Stadium would be located at the edge of the Health Sciences District and would not divide the Health Sciences District. The proposed Multi-Use Stadium would reinforce the existing bicycle and pedestrian connections between the Health Sciences District and the core campus.

### Noise

**Comment:** Concern expressed regarding noise from the airport and conflicts with the NMP.

**Response:** Section 4.10, Volume II of this EIR contains a detailed assessment of airport noise and adjacent land uses.

### Population and Housing

**Comment:** Several comments expressed the need for affordable student and employee housing and expressed support for increased on-campus housing.

**Response:** The NMP would offer housing to offset the demand created by the increase in the student population under the 2003 LRDP, and it would provide housing for approximately 13 percent of new faculty and staff. Housing demand associated with the 2003 LRDP is evaluated further in Section 4.11 Population and Housing (Volume II of the EIR).

**Comment:** Housing impacts associated with the proposed research park should be addressed.

**Response:** The housing impact analysis presented in Section 4.11 Population and Housing (Volume II of the EIR) addresses housing demand associated with all members of the projected population, including research park employees.

**Comment:** Spillover demand for housing in Dixon should be addressed.

**Response:** The potential environmental impacts from regional housing demand, including demand in Dixon, that is associated with the 2003 LRDP is evaluated further in Section 4.11 Population and Housing (Volume II of the EIR).

### Public Services

**Comment:** Campus police and fire services should serve NMP.

**Response:** Either campus or City of Davis fire and police services could serve the proposed NMP, as evaluated further in Section 4.12, Public Services, Volume II of this EIR. The campus will fully evaluate the service options for the neighborhood, and an option will be selected that

best provides operational and economic advantages to the campus, the City, and the NMP residents.

**Comment:** NMP's demand for and costs associated with City of Davis services should be assessed.

**Response:** Section 4.12, Public Services, Volume II of this EIR evaluates the NMP's potential demand for public services (including fire, police, and school services), which could be provided by the campus and/or the City of Davis. This section identifies the physical modifications that could be required to provide adequate City services, and it identifies mitigation to reduce associated environmental effects to the extent feasible. The CEQA Guidelines do not require an analysis of economic effects except in cases when economic changes may cause physical changes.

**Comment:** The Davis Joint Unified School District expressed thanks for UC Davis coordination efforts.

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment:** Impacts on local school capacity should be assessed.

**Response:** Section 4.12, Public Services, Volume II of this EIR considers the demand for school services associated the 2003 LRDP, and it evaluates the environmental implications associated with new facilities that could be required to accommodate this demand.

### **Recreation**

**Comment:** Recreational value of Olive Tree Lane and Putah Creek riparian area should be considered.

**Response:** The 2003 LRDP would provide for an expansion of the Putah Creek riparian area and does not identify changes to Olive Tree Lane. Section 4.13, Recreation, in Volume II of this EIR evaluates the demand associated with recreational resources under the 2003 LRDP.

**Comment:** Neighborhood should include recreational facilities.

**Response:** The proposed NMP would offer open space recreational areas including habitat areas, greenbelts, community gathering places, and recreational fields.

### **Traffic, Circulation, and Parking**

**Comment:** Traffic Impact Study should be prepared to meet identified standards.

**Response:** Section 4.14, Volume II contains a detailed assessment of potential traffic impacts.

**Comment:** Several comments expressed concern about traffic and safety impacts associated with a potential vehicular connection on Russell Blvd., and several comments indicated that such a connection should only be used for emergency access.

**Response:** Section 4.14, Volume II contains a detailed assessment of potential traffic impacts with and without a potential vehicular connection from the proposed NMP to Russell Boulevard. This information will be available to the public and to City and campus decision-makers.

**Comment:** A vehicular connection to Russell Blvd. is needed.

**Response:** Section 4.14, Volume II contains a detailed assessment of potential traffic impacts with and without a potential vehicular connection from the proposed NMP to Russell Boulevard.

## Appendix A

### Responses to Comments

---

**Comment:** Concern expressed about traffic impacts associated with Community Education Center.

**Response:** Section 4.14, Volume II contains a detailed assessment of traffic impacts associated with full implementation of the 2003 LRDP, including traffic impacts associated with the NMP. Additional traffic assessment related to the Community Education Center is provided in Section 2 of Volume III.

**Comment:** Impacts on bike plan should be addressed.

**Response:** Potential bike impacts are addressed in Section 4.14, Volume II of this EIR.

**Comment:** Strategies to reduce automobile use should be evaluated, including car sharing, bike and pedestrian connectivity, transit and shuttle service, and limited parking for on-campus student housing.

**Response:** Such strategies are planned and proposed for adoption as part of the NMP. Details of expected traffic impacts are provided in Section 4.14, Volume II and Section 2, Volume III of this EIR.

**Comment:** Traffic impacts on SR-113, 1-80, County Road 98, and along Russell Blvd. (including near Russell Ranch) should be addressed.

**Response:** Traffic impacts are evaluated in Section 4.14, Volume I of this EIR, including the requested evaluation. Traffic projections west of County Road 98 were not evaluated in detail because the observed low traffic volumes in these areas are not expected to be affected by the LRDP.

**Comment:** Adequate bike parking should be provided.

**Response:** Facilities planned during implementation of the 2003 LRDP will include adequate bike parking.

**Comment:** Concern expressed about inadequate parking in Health Sciences District with the Stadium.

**Response:** The traffic analysis for the Multi-Use Stadium included in Section 5, Volume III of the EIR contains a detailed evaluation of parking needs to accommodate the proposed stadium.

**Comment:** Support expressed for transit green in NMP.

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment:** Comment encouraged use of traffic circles.

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment:** Safety of transit green proposed for NMP should be evaluated.

**Response:** Safety of design features proposed in the NMP such as the transit green are evaluated in Volume III of the EIR.

**Comment:** Several comments expressed support for keeping the University Airport open.

**Response:** The 2003 LRDP does not propose to close the airport.

**Comment:** The relationship between the University Airport and the NMP should be evaluated, including proximity of the Neighborhood's elementary school, potential need for a buffer, and potential need for air traffic pattern changes.

**Response:** The 2003 LRDP EIR evaluates noise compatibility (Section 4.10, Volume II) and land use safety compatibility (Section 4.7, Volume I) between the existing airport and the proposed NMP.

**Comment:** Airport planning should be performed consistent with the Department of Transportation's standards.

**Response:** Section 4.10, Volume II of this EIR evaluates potential airport land use safety impact and utilizes the most recent airport land use safety planning guidance developed by the California Department of Transportation.

### Utilities

**Comment:** Impacts on the capacity of local landfills and wastewater treatment plans need to be addressed.

**Response:** Section 4.15, Utilities, in Volume II of this EIR fully assesses the 2003 LRDP's contribution to campus and regional landfills and wastewater treatment plants, and it evaluates expansions of these facilities that may be required.

**Comment:** Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards should be incorporated into campus planning.

**Response:** As discussed in Section 4.15, Utilities, in Volume II of this EIR, campus development under the 2003 LRDP will incorporate energy and water conservation features that are consistent with LEED standards. Many of the LEED standards are already used in campus buildings and planning.

**Comment:** The campus should consider its responsibility in providing and mitigating utilities.

**Response:** Section 4.15, Utilities, in Volume II of this EIR fully assesses the 2003 LRDP's contribution to demand for campus and regional utilities, and it evaluates expansions of these facilities that may be required. This section also identifies mitigation to reduce associated environmental effects to the extent feasible.

**Comment:** Support for solar lighting expressed.

**Response:** As discussed in Section 4.15, Utilities, in Volume II of this EIR, campus development under the 2003 LRDP will incorporate energy conservation features. The NMP is organized on principles of solar access for buildings and streets.

**Comment:** The current site of the campus landfill should be reevaluated due to its proximity to Putah Creek.

**Response:** The campus landfill would remain at its current location under the 2003 LRDP. As discussed in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, in Volume II of this EIR, runoff from the active face of the campus landfill is designed for onsite retention.