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PREFACE

Summary of Changes Since Publication of the Tiered Initial Study

Introduction

A Tiered Initial Study for the proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project was prepared and circulated from August 17, 2001, to September 17, 2001. The Tiered Initial Study included information about proposed use of office space in the conference center, the site for the relocation of Environmental Horticulture activities, current campus population and built space, and a summary discussion of potential cumulative effects associated with an anticipated increase of approximately 6,000 new students by year 2014-15, which the University President has identified as the campus’ share of the University of California's projected growth over that period. Appendix A of the Tiered Initial Study presented updated information regarding amendments to the 1994 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) and revisions to the 1994 LRDP Environmental Impact Report (EIR), through May 2001.

Since publication of the Tiered Initial Study, there have been changes that updated and/or clarified information provided in the Tiered Initial Study. These changes, which are summarized below and are presented in the order in which topical discussions appear in the Tiered Initial Study, do not substantially affect the conclusions presented in the Tiered Initial Study or the approach to the environmental analysis presented in this DEIR beyond that identified in the Tiered Initial Study.

Changes Since the August 2001 Tiered Initial Study

II. Project Information

The discussion in the Tiered Initial Study (pages 1 through 4) indicates that the 1994 LRDP and 1994 LRDP EIR have been amended since the approval of the 1994 LRDP and certification of the LRDP EIR. Appendix A in the Tiered Initial Study consolidated and summarized changes made to the 1994 LRDP and LRDP EIR through May 2001. The information presented in Appendix A of the Tiered Initial Study has been updated through November 2001 and is included as Appendix C of this DEIR. The updated information reflects an amendment to the 1994 LRDP and an update to the 1994 LRDP EIR that was made upon approval of the Segundo Housing Improvement Projects. In this amendment, 3.2 acres of land designated as Physical Education, Intercollegiate Athletics and Recreation were changes to Housing.
III. Project Description

The option to convert one floor of office space (approximately 10,000 assignable square feet [asf]) to additional conference center meeting room space (identified in the Tiered Initial Study on page 19) has been removed from the proposed project.

The proposed site for the relocated Environmental Horticulture teaching and research activities was changed from a location southeast of Brooks Road and east of the Hydraulics Lab (identified in the Tiered Initial Study on page 26) to a site north of Hutchison Drive near the University Airport. The new location is shown in Figure 3-3 of this DEIR. As with the previously proposed site, the new site is also designated in the 1994 LRDP as Teaching and Research Fields.

IV. Consistency with the LRDP

Scope of Development and Population

The campus space and population data presented in Table 2 (page 30 of the Tiered Initial Study) has been updated as of December 2001. Current data is presented in Table 1-1 and is discussed on pages 1-8 and 1-10 of this DEIR. As of December 2001, recently built and approved projects would bring the total Academic and Administrative space on-campus to 5,777,349 asf. On-campus population currently totals 34,468. The proposed project and one other project under consideration (Veterinary Medicine Instructional Facility) would add 147,690 asf and 948 people to the campus, for a revised total asf for existing, approved, and proposed projects of 5,920,039 and an on-campus population of 35,416. These totals remain below the 1994 LRDP 2005-06 projections. Chapter 1, Introduction, and Section 5.1-1, Growth-Inducing Impacts, of this DEIR reflect this new data.

Cumulative Analysis

The discussion on page 33 of the Tiered Initial Study summarized the campus plans for revising the 1994 LRDP to accommodate the campus’ share of University of California’s anticipated growth by 2015. To further address cumulative impacts of the proposed project within the context of this anticipated growth, the campus has prepared a Cumulative Impacts Analysis – Focus on Potential Environmental Effects Associated with Projected Student Enrollment Increases that addresses the potential cumulative impacts associated with anticipated growth in the campus population that would surpass growth projected in the 1994 LRDP. This assessment is included in Appendix D of this DEIR. Each technical section of this DEIR (land use, noise, transportation and circulation, and biological resources) includes a summary discussion of cumulative effects of increased enrollment through 2015, based on the information presented in Appendix D.
1. INTRODUCTION

This Focused Tiered Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) analyzes specific potential environmental effects of the proposed UC Davis Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building (proposed project) in four resource areas: Land Use and Planning, Transportation and Circulation, Noise, and Biological Resources.

Project Background

Upon approval of the Center for the Arts Performance Hall and South Entry Roadway and Parking Improvements Project, The Board of Regents of the University of California (The Regents) amended the 1994 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) land use designation of the proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project site. The amendment added a Potential Enterprise Opportunity overlay to the project site’s High Density Academic and Administrative designation (the site also includes the 1994 LRDP designation for Parking). The Center for the Arts Performance Hall and South Entry Roadway and Parking Improvements Project Tiered Initial Study, which was circulated for public and agency review from September 4, 1998 to October 5, 1998, indicated the following about the proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project site:

for the purposes of analysis, it is assumed that the site to the east of the Entry Quad could be developed as an academic building or a Hotel and Conference Center. For the purpose of the analysis in this Tiered Initial Study, cumulative impacts for utilities and traffic were evaluated consistent with these assumptions. The analysis includes an evaluation of the proposed amendment to the 1994 LRDP to change the land use designation to accommodate anticipated development on these sites. When the Campus identifies specific projects for these sites, additional environmental review would be conducted, as appropriate.

In September 2000, a Draft Tiered Initial Study for the UC Davis Conference Center and Hotel, and University Relations Building project (a project that included a conference center, hotel, and an administrative building on the proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project site) was circulated for public and agency review. In response to comments received on this document and to provide additional information, the campus circulated a Revised Draft Tiered Initial Study for the Conference Center and Hotel, and University Relations Building project from November 17 to December 18, 2000. A public scoping meeting for the project was held on December 4, 2000. In response to comments received on the Revised Draft Tiered Initial Study and programmatic review of the project, the campus made several changes to the previously proposed Conference Center and Hotel, and University Relations Building project. As a result, the environmental review for the modified project started over with publication of a new Initial Study for the Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project in August 2001.
This DEIR and the associated Initial Study (circulated in August 2001 and included as Appendix A) for the proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project reflects a new project and a separate environmental review. The primary project change initiated to address public concern about the previously proposed conference center and hotel project included reduction of the proposed hotel size from 150 to 75 rooms. In response to public comments, the campus also made changes to the project’s business plan that would: (1) eliminate perceived competitive advantages by eliminating tax-exempt financing and ensuring private financing by the developer; (2) charge fair market value for the land; (3) pay all applicable taxes in full; (4) require prevailing wage for conference and hotel construction and operation; (5) keep arrangements for UC Davis business with local hotels to provide accommodations for visiting sports teams; (6) eliminate the complete meeting package so conference attendees will have more options to use local hotels and restaurants; (7) develop enhanced bicycle and pedestrian links along the Arboretum; and (8) use the interim tax generated by the project to increase occupancy in local hotels and to encourage patronage of downtown Davis businesses by paying the campus’ membership in the Davis Conference and Visitors Bureau and supporting joint marketing efforts (including tram service to downtown Davis). Differences between the currently and previously proposed conference center and hotel projects are discussed further in Section II of the Tiered Initial Study (see Appendix A).

**Purpose of the Focused Tiered EIR**

UC Davis has prepared this Focused Tiered DEIR for the following purposes:

- to satisfy the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA);
- to inform the general public, the local community, responsible and interested public agencies, and the University of the nature of the proposed project, the possible environmental effects, possible measures to mitigate those effects, and alternatives to the proposed project; and
- to enable The Board of Regents of the University of California (The Regents) to consider environmental consequences when deciding whether to approve the proposed project.

As provided in the CEQA Guidelines, public agencies are charged with the duty to avoid or minimize environmental damage where feasible. In discharging this duty, the public agency has an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social objectives (Section 15021 of the CEQA Guidelines). This Focused Tiered DEIR is a public information document, the purpose of which is to identify the potential significant effects of the proposed project on the environment and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be avoided or mitigated, to identify any unavoidable adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated, and to identify reasonable and feasible alternatives to the project that would eliminate any significant adverse environmental effects or reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. This Focused Tiered DEIR also discloses growth-inducing impacts, effects found not to be significant, and cumulative impacts.
The lead agency (The Regents) is required to consider the information in this EIR, along with any other relevant information, in making its decision on whether to approve the proposed project (Section 15121 of the CEQA Guidelines). Although the EIR does not determine the ultimate decision that will be made regarding approval of the project, The Regents must consider the information in the EIR and make findings regarding each significant effect identified in the EIR.

For the proposed UC Davis Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project, CEQA requires that The Regents prepare a DEIR that reflects the independent judgment of the University of California (the University) regarding the impacts, level of significance of the impacts both before and after mitigation, and mitigation measures and alternatives proposed to reduce the impacts. The DEIR is then circulated to responsible agencies, trustee agencies with resources affected by the projects, and interested agencies and individuals. The purpose of public and agency review of the DEIR includes sharing expertise, disclosing agency analyses, checking for accuracy, detecting omissions, discovering public concerns, and soliciting counterproposals. In reviewing the DEIR, reviewers should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment, and avoiding or mitigating the significant environmental effects of the proposed project.

**Summary of the Proposed Project**

The proposed project includes construction of a conference center facility, a hotel, and a building for the Graduate School of Management on approximately five acres in the south entry area of the central campus (see Figure 3-2 in Chapter 3, Project Description). The conference center facility would comprise approximately 75,000 gross square feet (gsf) (55,000 assignable square feet [asf]) and would accommodate conference center operations and office space for units within the Office of University Relations. The hotel would comprise approximately 40,000 gsf (28,000 asf) and would include 75 guest rooms. The Graduate School of Management Building would comprise 45,000 gsf (27,000 asf) and would accommodate space for the Graduate School of Management, units within the Office of University Relations, and the Internship and Career Center. The project would also establish associated open space and landscaping, and it would construct a 100-space parking area.

In addition, Department of Environmental Horticulture teaching and research field activities currently located on about four acres of the five-acre project site would be relocated to the west campus on a parcel located north of Hutchison Drive near the University Airport (see Figure 3-3 in Chapter 3, Project Description). A greenhouse and an agricultural support building would be constructed on less than two acres at this new site.

Please see Chapter 3, Project Description, for a complete description of the proposed project.

**Reason to Prepare Focused Tiered EIR**

This environmental analysis is a Focused Tiered Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed UC Davis Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project. The environmental analysis for the proposed project is tiered from the UC Davis 1994
LRDP EIR in accordance with Sections 15152 and 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines and Public Resource Code Section 21094. The 1994 LRDP EIR is a Program EIR, prepared pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Sections 15000 et seq.). The 1994 LRDP EIR analyzed full implementation of uses and physical development proposed under the 1994 LRDP through the year 2005-06, and identified measures to mitigate the significant adverse project and cumulative impacts associated with that growth.

The CEQA concept of “tiering” refers to the coverage of general environmental matters in broad program-level EIRs, with subsequent focused environmental documents for individual projects that implement the program. The project environmental document incorporates by reference the discussions in the Program EIR and concentrates on project-specific issues. CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines encourage the use of tiered environmental documents to reduce delays and excessive paperwork in the environmental review process. This is accomplished in tiered documents by eliminating repetitive analyses of issues that were adequately addressed in the Program EIR and by incorporating those analyses by reference under CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(d).

Where an EIR has been prepared or certified for a program or plan, the environmental review for a later activity consistent with the program or plan should be limited to environmental effects that were not analyzed as significant in the prior EIR or that are susceptible to substantial reduction or avoidance (CEQA Guidelines Section 15152[d]).

Accordingly, the tiering of the environmental analysis for the proposed project allows this Focused Tiered EIR to rely on the 1994 LRDP EIR for the following:

- a discussion of general background and setting information for environmental topic areas; and
- issues that were evaluated in sufficient detail in the 1994 LRDP EIR for which there is no significant new information or change in circumstances that would require further analysis.

All applicable 1994 LRDP EIR mitigation measures are incorporated into and made part of the project. These mitigation measures are identified and discussed in the Tiered Initial Study (Appendix A) and in Chapter 4 of this Focused Tiered DEIR.

**1994 LRDP and 1994 LRDP EIR**

The 1994 LRDP EIR is a program EIR, prepared pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Sections 15000 et seq.). The 1994 LRDP EIR analyzed full implementation of uses and physical development proposed under the 1994 LRDP through the year 2005-06, and identified measures to mitigate the significant adverse project and cumulative impacts associated with that growth.

The analysis provided in this DEIR reflects the 1994 LRDP, as amended, and it is tiered from the 1994 LRDP EIR, as updated and revised. The following subsections summarize amendments to the 1994 LRDP and updates and revisions to the 1994 LRDP EIR, address the project's
consistency with the amended 1994 LRDP, and introduce the Cumulative Impact Analysis that addresses environmental effects associated with student enrollment increases anticipated through 2014-15.

**Amendments to the 1994 LRDP and Updates and Revisions to the 1994 LRDP EIR**

The Regents has amended the 1994 LRDP upon approval of subsequent projects (and associated certification of EIRs and adoption of Mitigated Negative Declarations) that required land use designation changes, revisions of program objectives, or changes in the campus land inventory to maintain conformity with the 1994 LRDP. The Regents has not changed the population projections and total facility growth allowed under the 1994 LRDP. The Regents has revised the 1994 LRDP EIR upon approval of projects (and certification of associated EIRs and adoption of associated Mitigated Negative Declarations) that required changes to impacts and/or mitigation measures. The 1994 LRDP EIR has also been updated when new analyses presented in certified EIRs or adopted Mitigated Negative Declarations changed the analyses presented in the 1994 LRDP EIR. A comprehensive discussion of amendments to the 1994 LRDP and updates and revisions to the 1994 LRDP EIR is included as Appendix C of this DEIR.

The Regents amended the 1994 LRDP to accommodate the following projects: the Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Replacement Project, the 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects, the Center for the Arts Performance Hall and South Entry Roadways and Parking Improvements Project, the Western Human Nutrition Research Center Project, and the Segundo Housing Improvement Projects. In total, approximately 103 acres have been redesignated to accommodate projects and associated mitigation areas, one plan objective has been deleted, and 150 acres of land has been added to the campus. Figure 1 in Appendix C of this DEIR provides the current campus map with updated land use designations.

The 1994 LRDP EIR was updated and revised upon approval of the projects listed above as well as the Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities Project. The list below summarizes updates and revisions to the 1994 LRDP EIR.

**Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Replacement Project EIR (State Clearinghouse Nos. 95123027 and 96072024):**

- Updated 1994 LRDP EIR analysis to reflect changes to 1994 land use designations (Section 4.6 of the WWTP Replacement Project Draft EIR).

- Identified the loss of an additional 20 acres of prime agricultural land and ruderal/annual grassland habitat over the amount identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR analysis and increased the magnitude of land use and biological resource impacts associated with this loss (Sections 4.4 and 4.6 of the WWTP Replacement Project Draft EIR, and Appendix G of the Final EIR).

- Reevaluated cumulative 1994 LRDP EIR Hydrology and Water Quality, Hazardous Materials and Public Safety, and Air Quality impacts (Sections 4.1, 4.3, and 4.3 of the Focused Tiered Draft EIR).
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1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects Supplemental EIR (SEIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 97122016):

- Updated 1994 LRDP EIR analysis to reflect changes to 1994 LRDP land use designations (Sections 5.3, 6.3, and 7.3 of the Draft SEIR).

- Identified the loss of an additional 20 acres of prime agricultural land and 31 acres of ruderal/annual grassland habitat over the amount identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR. To mitigate this loss, identified measure to redesignate 20 acres of prime farmland and ruderal/annual grassland habitat at the Russell Ranch from land designated as Academic and Administrative Low Density to Teaching and Research Fields (Sections 5.3, 5.5, 6.3, 6.5, 7.3, and 7.5 of the Draft SEIR).

- Identified the loss of 11 acres of ruderal/annual grassland habitat over the amount identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR analysis and increased the magnitude of biological resource impacts associated with this loss (Appendix A of the Final SEIR).

- Included project-specific mitigation measure to reduce the magnitude, but not the level of significance, of the cumulative impact on burrowing owl nesting habitat (Section 2 of the Draft SEIR).

- Included updated transportation and circulation analysis to assess a new traffic survey and the decision by the City of Davis not to expand the Richards Boulevard undercrossing from two to four lanes. Revised 1994 LRDP EIR transportation Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 (b) to account for the new traffic information (Section 8 of the Draft SEIR).

- Reevaluated cumulative air quality and noise impacts (Section 8 of the Draft SEIR).

Center for the Arts Performance Hall and South Entry Roadway and Parking Improvements Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 98092016):

- Updated 1994 LRDP EIR analysis to reflect changes to 1994 LRDP land use designations (page 29 of the Center for the Arts Tiered Initial Study).

- Identified the loss of 8.5 acres of prime farmland and ruderal/annual grassland habitat over the amount assessed in the 1994 LRDP EIR. To mitigate this loss, identified measure to redesignate 8.5 acres of prime farmland and ruderal/annual grassland habitat designated as Support to Teaching and Research Fields (pages 29-30 and 60 of the Tiered Initial Study).

USDA Western Human Nutrition Research Complex Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 99092060):

- Updated the 1994 LRDP EIR analysis to reflect changes to land use designations presented in the 1994 LRDP (pages 24-25 of the Initial Study).
Revised a project-specific mitigation measure presented in the 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR that reduced the magnitude, but not the level of significance, of the cumulative impact on burrowing owl nesting habitat (page 65 of the Initial Study).

Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities Focused Tiered EIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2000022057):

- Further updated the 1994 LRDP EIR cumulative transportation and circulation impact analysis to account for more accurate estimates of campus population growth in the Health Sciences District. The updated analysis identified that the intersection of Hutchison Drive and Health Sciences Drive would exceed level of service standards. Included a mitigation measure to reduce the impact at this intersection to a less-than-significant level (Section 3 of the Final EIR).

Segundo Housing Improvements Projects Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (State Clearinghouse No. 2001092063):

- Updated the 1994 LRDP EIR analysis to reflect changes to the land use designations presented in the 1994 LRDP (pages 33-35 of the Tiered Initial Study).

Environmental documents that identify amendments to the 1994 LRDP and updates and revisions to the 1994 LRDP EIR are available for review during normal operating hours at the UC Davis Office of Resource Management and Planning, 376 Mrak Hall on the UC Davis Campus; at Reserves in Shields Library on the UC Davis campus; at the Yolo County Public Library, 315 E. 14th Street, Davis; at the Vacaville Public Library, 120 Ulatis Drive, Vacaville; and online at http://www.ormp.ucdavis.edu/environreview (technical appendices are not available online).

When approving the design of the Center for the Arts Performance Hall and South Entry Roadway and Parking Improvements Project and adopting that project's Mitigated Negative Declaration, The Regents changed the land use designation of parcels within the south entry area to maintain conformity with the LRDP. These changes included adding a Potential Enterprise Opportunity designation overlay to the High Density Academic and Administrative designation of the proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building site. In addition, the Center for the Arts Performance Hall and South Entry Roadway and Parking Improvements Tiered Initial Study indicated the following: “for the purposes of analysis, it is assumed that the site to the east of the Entry Quad could be developed as an academic building or a Hotel and Conference Center. For the purpose of the analysis in this Tiered Initial Study, cumulative impacts for utilities and traffic were evaluated consistent with these assumptions. The analysis includes an evaluation of the proposed amendment to the 1994 LRDP to change the land use designation to accommodate anticipated development on these sites. When the Campus identifies specific projects for these sites, additional environmental review would be conducted, as appropriate.”
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Consistency with the 1994 LRDP

1994 LRDP Scope of Development

The 1994 LRDP approved development of approximately 1.75 million asf by 2005-06 for academic and administrative uses (including instruction and research, libraries, student services, administrative/support, and public service/non University agencies). The 1994 LRDP EIR assumed total campus academic and administrative development in 2005-06 would be 6,495,740 asf. Academic and administrative projects currently under consideration include the proposed project and the Veterinary Medicine Instructional Facility. These academic and administrative projects would cumulatively add approximately 147,690 asf to the campus (increasing the space on campus to 5,920,039 asf). As shown in Table 1-1, this space would not exceed the 6,495,750 asf of development approved under the 1994 LRDP. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with 1994 LRDP scope of development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROJECTED POPULATION AND ACADEMIC AND ADMINISTRATIVE ASSIGNABLE SQUARE FEET FOR PROJECTS CURRENTLY UNDER ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Academic and Administrative Assignable Square Feet</th>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th>Staff Population</th>
<th>Total On-Campus Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Built or Approved as of December 2001</td>
<td>5,772,349</td>
<td>23,605</td>
<td>10,863</td>
<td>34,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine Instructional Facility</td>
<td>37,690</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Proposed</strong></td>
<td><strong>147,690</strong></td>
<td><strong>568</strong></td>
<td><strong>380</strong></td>
<td><strong>948</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Academic and Administrative Assignable Square Feet</th>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th>Staff Population</th>
<th>Total On-Campus Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing, Approved, and Proposed Projects</td>
<td>5,920,039</td>
<td>24,173</td>
<td>11,243</td>
<td>35,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projections for 2005-06 (LRDP)</td>
<td>6,495,750</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>12,630</td>
<td>38,630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A: Not Applicable. Projects are not considered academic and administrative development.

1994 LRDP Land Use Designation

The 1994 LRDP land use designations for the project site, as amended upon approval of the Center for the Arts Performance Hall and South Entry Roadway and Parking Improvements Project, include High Density Academic and Administrative - Potential Enterprise Opportunity and Parking.

Uses allowed under the High Density Academic and Administrative designation (defined on pages 45 and 46 of the 1994 LRDP) include those that support and advance the instruction and
research mission of the campus. The designation allows for buildings up to nine stories high, including classrooms, research laboratories, and research support areas, student and staff offices, and libraries. In addition, this land use designation includes space for student activities, museums, administrative offices, meeting rooms, and public service activities linked to the campus. Existing High Density Academic and Administrative space on campus includes a variety of venues that generate revenue and are open to the general public, including those in the Memorial Union (the Coffee House, the campus Bookstore and computer shop, and a bowling alley) and in the Silo (Silo Pub and Café, Taco Bell, Carl's Jr., Pizza Hut, Sub-City Sandwiches, and Starbucks). These venues are consistent with the High Density Academic and Administrative designation because they support the campus’ instruction and research mission. Similarly, the proposed conference center and hotel would be open to the general public, would be revenue-generating in nature, and would support the campus’ instruction and research mission. As discussed in Chapter 3 of this DEIR in the subsection titled “Project Background and Need,” the proposed conference center and hotel would accommodate academic conferences and professional meetings, thereby substantially contributing to UC Davis’ academic program.

The Potential Enterprise Opportunity overlay (defined on page 46 of the 1994 LRDP) can be applied over various land use categories and signifies that associated development will be primarily financed in cooperation with entities external to the campus. Enterprise areas are intended to provide the flexibility for academic and administrative units to respond to initiatives that further the academic mission. In addition, as indicated on page 67 of the 1994 LRDP, Enterprise activities include “projects that benefit campus academic programs by hosting public or private research and outreach activities on campus land.” Consistent with this overlay, the proposed project would be partially funded by a development partnership with a private entity.

The 1994 LRDP defines the Parking land use designation as surface and structure lots with 100 or more spaces. The parking component of the proposed project would be consistent with the site’s Parking designation.

The proposed conference center, hotel, and Graduate School of Management building would, therefore, be consistent with the project site’s High Density Academic and Administrative with Potential Enterprise Opportunity and Parking land use designations.

Environmental Horticulture teaching and research fields activities currently located on the site would be relocated to the west campus on a parcel designated as Teaching and Research Fields in the 1994 LRDP. The Teaching and Research Fields designation includes agricultural lands used for teaching, research, and support of academic programs, and it may include “agricultural-related” buildings on sites smaller than two acres. Relocated Environmental Horticulture activities would be consistent with this land use designation.

1994 LRDP Population Projections

The on-campus population anticipated under the 1994 LRDP for 2005-06 is 38,630 (26,000 students and 12,630 faculty and staff). The 1999-2000 on-campus population estimate was 32,775 (22,887 students and 9,888 faculty and staff). Recently built and approved projects as of December 2001 would bring the population to approximately 34,468 (23,605 students and 10,863 staff). The proposed project would contribute approximately 375 new campus
employees. The project would not contribute new students. Population growth associated with
the proposed project would not exceed population projections assumed in the 1994 LRDP EIR.
The proposed project and one other project currently under consideration (the Veterinary
Medicine Instructional Facility) would add approximately 380 new campus employees and 568
new students to this total (see Table 1-1) and would also not exceed the on-campus population
anticipated under the 1994 LRDP. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with
1994 LRDP population projections.

1994 LRDP Objectives

The LRDP contains specific objectives that are relevant to the proposed project. These include
the following:

**Preserve Agricultural Lands.** Concentrate high density development in the Central Campus to
preserve the large blocks of agricultural land in the West and South Campus, and Russell Ranch.
[Soils, page 26 of the 1994 LRDP]

**Location of Programs.** Cluster related academic and administrative programs geographically,
when feasible, to facilitate academic interaction. [Developed Resource Objective, page 36 of the
1994 LRDP]

**Central Campus.** Concentrate high density academic development on the Central Campus.
[Land Use Plan Objective, page 48 of the 1994 LRDP]

**Enterprise Areas.** Designate high and low density academic sites as Enterprise Area to facilitate
academic initiatives outside the academic core. (See Enterprise section). These may include the
types of uses for which the campus has previously utilized lands in the South Davis Research
Park. [Academic and Administrative Land Use Objective, page 54 of the 1994 LRDP] Enterprise
activity specifically considered in the 1994 LRDP includes projects that benefit campus academic
programs by hosting public or private research and outreach activities on campus land [Number 3
Enterprise Reserves, 1994 LRDP].

**High Density Academic.** Reserve high density academic and administrative lands near the
academic core of the campus for Enterprise partnership. [Enterprise Reserve Objective, page 68
of the 1994 LRDP]

**New Open Space Accompanying New Development.** Develop new common open spaces and
tree-lined streets as the built environment expands, reinforcing the value that the campus
community places on open space. The exact configuration of these spaces will be addressed by
the district planning process, providing more detailed site planning guidelines within the context
of the LRDP. [Open Space Objective, page 76 of the 1994 LRDP]

**Freeway Access.** The two freeway interchanges that directly serve the campus are valuable
transportation assets. Concentrate new parking in locations that are easily accessible from
Highway 113 at Hutchison Drive and Interstate 80 at Old Davis Road. This will limit traffic
impacts on City of Davis streets. [Transportation and Parking Objective 6, page 80 of the 1994
LRDP]

**Parking Options.** Supply parking through a combination of: 1) infill surface parking in the
academic core, 2) additional parking structure(s) on the edge of the academic core, 3) peripheral
surface parking adjacent to the perimeter road, and 4) parking for campus residents.
[Transportation and Parking Objective 7, page 80 of the 1994 LRDP]
The conference center, hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building are high density uses that would be located in the central campus, consistent with “Preserve Agricultural Lands,” “Central Campus,” and “High Density Academic” objectives. The proposed conference center and hotel would be consistent with the “Enterprise Areas” objective, and they would meet the 1994 LRDP’s specific consideration of enterprise projects that benefit campus academic programs by hosting public or private research and outreach activities. The buildings would be located adjacent to the Robert and Margrit Mondavi Center for the Performing Arts (under construction) and the existing Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center and would work with these adjacent uses to add to UC Davis' role as a regional center and meeting place, consistent with “Location of Programs” objective. The project would provide new open space areas and infill surface parking, consistent with “New Open Space Accompanying New Development” and “Parking Options” objectives. The project would also be located in the south entry area of campus, easily accessible from I-80, consistent with “Freeway Access” objective. Please refer to Appendix A, Tiered Initial Study and Notice of Preparation, Section IV for additional discussion on specific LRDP objectives and their relevance to the proposed project.

Adequacy of the 1994 LRDP EIR through 2005-06

As presented in Appendix D of this document, the campus has updated projections for campus growth through 2005-06 based on information provided by the University regarding enrollment growth and based on reasonably foreseeable campus projects. Based on the analysis in Appendix D, the campus concluded that because development and the effects associated with projected increases in the campus population through 2005-06 will be within the parameters assumed in the 1994 LRDP, the cumulative impacts of growth through 2005-06 have been adequately addressed in the 1994 LRDP EIR.

Cumulative Impacts Analysis - Environmental Effects through 2014-15

The University currently anticipates that enrollment throughout the University system will increase by approximately 60,000 to 70,000 students within the next 10 to 15 years. This growth in enrollment is related to projected demographic changes that are expected to increase the demand for a college education in California. UC Davis is currently considering how it should plan to accommodate the enrollment growth that the University President has identified as the UC Davis' share of the University's projected growth. This growth is anticipated to bring the three-quarter average on-campus student population to approximately 29,500 by 2014-15. The 1994 LRDP already assumed 26,000 of these students. This anticipated enrollment growth and associated increases in employees and facility construction for 2014-15 would extend beyond the assumptions identified in the 1994 LRDP for 2005-06 and evaluated in the 1994 LRDP EIR. The campus will prepare a revised LRDP to identify the changes required to accommodate anticipated growth, and the campus will prepare an EIR to assess the environmental impacts of such changes. It is anticipated that The Regents will review and consider approval of the updated LRDP and its EIR in the fall of 2003.

To the extent that growth and physical development anticipated for 2014-15 were not considered in the 1994 LRDP EIR, additional environmental effects that were not previously identified may occur. However, it would be very speculative to determine these effects now because most components of the next LRDP are not currently known. Nevertheless, the campus has prepared a
Cumulative Impacts Analysis, presented as Appendix D of this document, that serves to inform the public concerning all that is currently known about the campus' potential growth through 2014-15. The resource evaluations presented in this Draft EIR also include brief discussions about possible cumulative environmental effects of anticipated growth and development through 2014-15.

**Scope of the Focused Tiered EIR**

For the resource areas listed below, the analysis in the Tiered Initial Study (Appendix A) indicated that the proposed project would not result in any potentially significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant levels or are not sufficiently addressed in the 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised. These issue areas are not included in the EIR analyses because they would result in either: no impact; a less-than-significant impact; a less-than-significant impact with the incorporation of 1994 LRDP EIR mitigation measures; or would contribute to a significant unavoidable impact that was adequately analyzed in the 1994 LRDP EIR for which no new mitigation measures are available and no new analysis is proposed.

- Agricultural Resources
- Population and Housing
- Air Quality
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Geology and Soils
- Mineral Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Aesthetics
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Utilities Service Systems

The Tiered Initial Study concluded that further analysis was required to more fully evaluate impacts in the resource areas of land use and planning, transportation and circulation, noise, and biological resources. Therefore, the Tiered Initial Study determined that impacts in these resource areas could be potentially significant. For this reason, a Focused Tiered EIR has been prepared to further evaluate the significance of impacts in these environmental resource areas and to develop project-specific mitigation measures for these areas, if necessary. Specifically, the Focused Tiered EIR evaluates the following potential impacts associated with the proposed project:

- **Land Use and Planning** - physical changes in the City of Davis that could result from the economic impact of operating the proposed conference center and hotel, and potential conflicts with the City of Davis General Plan;

- **Transportation and Circulation** - impacts from increased vehicle trips and parking demand;

- **Noise** - increased noise levels associated with increased vehicle trips; and
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- **Biological Resources** – potential loss of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat.

**Environmental Review and Approval Process**

**Public and Agency Review**

A Tiered Initial Study for the new and currently proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project was prepared and circulated from August 17, 2001, to September 17, 2001. Comments received during this public and agency review period, and responses to these comments are provided in Appendix B of this DEIR.

This Focused Tiered DEIR will be circulated for a 45-day public agency review from December 21, 2001 to February 4, 2002. Comments on the Focused Tiered DEIR must be received by 5:00 p.m. on February 4, 2002 and may be emailed to environreview@ucdavis.edu or sent to:

John A. Meyer  
Vice Chancellor  
Resource Management and Planning  
376 Mrak Hall  
University of California  
One Shields Avenue  
Davis, CA 95616

Comments relating to the Focused Tiered DEIR may also be presented orally during a public hearing on January 22, 2002, at 7:00 PM at the University Club on the UC Davis campus.

**Availability of Documents**

This Focused Tiered EIR is available during normal operating hours at the UC Davis Office of Resource Management and Planning at 376 Mrak Hall on the UC Davis campus; at the Reserves in Shields Library on the UC Davis campus; at the Yolo County Public Library, 315 E. 14th Street, Davis; at the Vacaville Public Library, 1020 Ulatis Drive, Vacaville; and online during the public review period at http://www.ormp.ucdavis.edu/environreview/. Copies of the 1994 LRDP and LRDP EIR, WWTP Replacement Project EIR, 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR, Center for the Arts Performance Hall and Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration, Western Human Nutrition Research Center Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration, Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities Focused Tiered EIR, the Segundo Housing Improvement Projects Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration are also available at the above locations. Reference material used in the preparation of these documents is also available during normal office hours at the Office of Resource Management and Planning.

**Project Approvals**

Following the public hearing on this Focused Tiered DEIR and after the close of the written public comment period, responses to written and oral comments on the environmental effects of the proposed project will be prepared and published in a Focused Tiered Final EIR document.
The EIR (comprised of the DEIR and Final EIR documents) will be considered by The Regents in a public meeting and will be certified if it is determined to be in compliance with CEQA. Following certification of the Focused Tiered EIR, The Regents will consider approval of the proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building, and the proposed redesignation of two acres of Support use in the west campus, west of County Road 98 and north of the Campus Landfill, to Teaching and Research Fields.

CEQA requires the decision-makers to balance the benefits of a proposed project against any unavoidable impacts. The Regents may still approve the project if it believes that social, economic, or other benefits outweigh identified significant unavoidable impacts (see Table 2-1 and Chapter 4). The Regents would then be required to state in writing the specific reasons for approving the project based on information in the Focused Tiered EIR and other information in the record. As indicated in Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, this reasoning is called a “statement of overriding considerations.” It is anticipated that The Regents will consider design approval of the proposed project in March 2002.

CEQA Findings and Mitigation Monitoring

CEQA requires that when a public agency makes findings based on an EIR, the public agency must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for those measures it has adopted or made a condition of project approval to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6). The reporting and monitoring program must be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6).

The Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) for the UC Davis Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project will be prepared, and will be considered by The Regents in conjunction with its review of the proposed project.

Report Organization

This Focused Tiered DEIR is organized into the following sections.

Chapter 1 – Introduction: provides an introduction and overview describing the intended use and scope of the Focused Tiered DEIR, its relationship to the 1994 LRDP and LRDP EIR, and the environmental review process.

Chapter 2 – Summary: summarizes the description of the proposed project and environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project, describes proposed mitigation measures, and indicates the levels of significance of impacts after mitigation. This Section also presents alternatives to the proposed project and known areas of controversy.

Chapter 3 – Project Description: provides a detailed description of the proposed project, including project location, background information, objectives, and structural and technical characteristics.

Chapter 4 – Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures: contains project-specific and cumulative impact analyses for each resource area identified for further analysis in
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the Tiered Initial Study (Appendix A). For each resource area, this section provides a description of the environmental setting, potential impacts of the proposed project, cumulative impacts of the project in conjunction with the overall growth and development included in the 1994 LRDP and in the Davis region, and mitigation measures.

**Chapter 5 – CEQA Considerations:** provides a discussion of growth inducement, significant and unavoidable impacts, and irreversible environmental effects of the proposed project.

**Chapter 6 – Alternatives to the Proposed Project:** identifies and discusses alternatives considered in the development of the proposed project and the associated environmental effects.

**Chapter 7 – References:** presents materials used in the preparation of this report.

**Chapter 8 – Report Preparers:** presents the preparers of this report.

**Appendices** – contains supporting documentation used in preparing the DEIR analysis. The appendices also include the Notice of Preparation and Tiered Initial Study and responses to comments on the Notice of Preparation. Please refer to the Table of Contents for a complete listing of appendices included in this DEIR.
1. Introduction

ENDNOTES


2. Larry N. Vanderhoef, Chancellor, letter to Yolo County Board of Supervisors and Davis City Council, August 15, 2001.
2. SUMMARY

**Project Under Review**

This Draft Focused Tiered EIR evaluates the potential environmental impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed UC Davis Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project. Specifically, this document evaluates potential significant effects in the following resource areas: Land Use and Planning, Transportation and Circulation, Noise, and Biological Resources.

**Project Description**

The proposed project includes construction of a conference center facility, a hotel, and a building for the Graduate School of Management on approximately five acres in the south entry area of the central campus (see Figure 3-2). The conference center facility would comprise approximately 75,000 gsf (55,000 asf). The hotel would comprise approximately 40,000 gsf (28,000 asf) and would include 75 guest rooms. The Graduate School of Management Building would comprise 45,000 gsf (27,000 asf) and would accommodate space for the Graduate School of Management, units within the Office of University Relations, and Internship and Career Center. The project would also establish associated open space and landscaping, and it would construct a 100-space parking area. In addition, Department of Environmental Horticulture teaching and research field activities currently located on about four acres of the five-acre project site would be relocated to the west campus on a parcel located north of Hutchison Drive near the University Airport (see Figure 3-3). A greenhouse and an agricultural support building would be constructed on less than two acres at this new site.

Please see Chapter 3, Project Description, for a complete description of proposed project elements and project objectives.

**Known Areas Of Controversy**

Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR identify areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. Issues of concern raised by agencies and the public (including issues of concern raised in response to previously published Initial Studies for a similar, but larger, project) are described below.

**Previously Published Initial Study for a Similar Project**

A Tiered Initial Study for a previously proposed conference center and larger hotel project (the Conference Center and Hotel, and University Relations Building project) was circulated from September 26, 2000 to October 27, 2000. Several agencies, a local jurisdiction, and individuals
commented on the September 2000 Tiered Initial Study. In response to comments received on this document and provide additional information, a Revised Tiered Initial Study was published in November 2000 and circulated from November 17, 2000 to December 18, 2000. Letters received on the Revised Tiered Initial Study included comments from residents, businesses, and the City of Davis Planning and Building Department. Those comments are summarized below.

Comments from the City of Davis expressed concern that adverse physical changes to downtown Davis would occur resulting from socio/economic impacts of the proposed project. Other commentors also raised concerns regarding the economic effect of the proposed project on existing businesses, including hotels in particular. The potential for the proposed project to result in significant adverse physical impacts due to changes in socio/economic conditions in the City of Davis are evaluated in Section 4.2, Land Use, of this Focused Tiered DEIR.

Comments from multiple commentors were received regarding project alternatives. Additional comments addressed the objectives of the project, growth-inducing impacts, and effects on off-site locations, such as commercial land uses. Project objectives are discussed in the Project Description in Chapter 3, project alternatives are discussed in Chapter 6, and a discussion of growth-inducing effects of the proposed project is included in Section 5.1 of this Focused Tiered DEIR.

A letter from William D. Kopper on behalf of Charles Guenther and Davis Citizens for Responsible University Development also questioned whether the proposed project was consistent with the 1994 LRDP and raised additional concern over transportation effects, and population and housing issues related to new employees. Land use consistency with the 1994 LRDP is addressed in Section 4.2, Land Use, in this Focused Tiered DEIR. A discussion of the proposed project’s contribution to the campus employee population is included in Chapter 1, Introduction, and a traffic analysis is included in Section 4.3, Transportation and Circulation, of this Focused Tiered DEIR.

Hotel, Conference Center, and Graduate School of Management Initial Study

A Tiered Initial Study was circulated for the proposed project from August 17, 2001 to September 17, 2001. Several agencies, a local jurisdiction, and individuals commented on the Tiered Initial Study. These comments are summarized below.

Comments from the City of Davis expressed concern that adverse physical changes to downtown Davis would occur resulting from socio/economic impacts of the proposed project. Other commentors also raised concerns regarding the economic effect of the proposed project on existing businesses, including hotels in particular. The potential for the proposed project to result in significant adverse physical impacts due to changes in socio/economic conditions in the City of Davis are evaluated in Section 4.2, Land Use and Planning, of this Focused Tiered DEIR.

The City also questioned whether the proposed project was consistent with the 1994 LRDP land use designations. Consistency with the 1994 LRDP is discussed in Chapter 1 of this DEIR.
In addition, the City of Davis commented on the City’s revised General Plan and the fact that Level of Service (LOS) standards of significance and mitigation measures have been revised. Consistency with the updated General Plan is discussed in Section 4.2 of this DEIR.

Comments from multiple commentors, including the City of Davis were received regarding project alternatives. Alternatives to the proposed project are evaluated in this DEIR in Chapter 6, Alternatives to the Proposed Project.

A letter the California Department of Fish and Game expressed concern with regard to possible Swainson’s hawk habitat on the site. Impacts 4.5-1 and 4.5-2 in this DEIR discuss potential effects on loss of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat, and Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 has been identified to reduce effects to a less-than-significant level through 1:1 habitat replacement, consistent with CDFG requirements. Construction-related impacts on Swainson’s hawk were discussed in Item 8b on pages 98 through 99 in the Initial Study (Appendix A in this DEIR).

A letter from the State of California Department of Transportation, District 3 included extensive comments on the need for a cumulative analysis and the appropriate assumptions to use. A traffic analysis is included in Section 4.3, Transportation and Circulation, of this Focused Tiered DEIR.

**Alternatives Analysis**

The following alternatives are evaluated in Chapter 6 of this DEIR and are compared to the proposed project to identify the environmentally superior alternative:

**No Project – No Development Alternative** – The proposed project sites would remain in their current condition and development of the proposed conference center, hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building would not occur.

**No Project - Expected Development Alternative** – The proposed project sites would be developed consistent with 1994 LRDP land use designations of High Density Academic and Administrative – Potential Enterprise Opportunity and Parking. The conference center, hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building would not be developed.

**Conference Center without Hotel and Restaurant Facilities** – The proposed conference center would be developed on the proposed project site without the proposed hotel and restaurant facilities. The Graduate School of Management Building would be constructed and operated consistent with the proposed project.

**Conference Center with Reduced Size Hotel** - This alternative assumes the proposed conference center would be developed on the proposed project site with a 50-room hotel and restaurant and pub facilities. The Graduate School of Management Building would be constructed and operated consistent with the proposed project.

**South Campus Site Alternative** – The proposed project would be constructed in the I-80 Enterprise Reserve south of I-80.
Conference Center and Hotel West of the South Entry Parking Structure - The proposed project would be constructed on a site west of the South Entry Parking Structure. All elements of the project would be the same under this alternative.

Conference Center and Hotel at Hutchinson Drive and La Rue Road - The proposed project would be constructed on a site in the central campus southwest of the intersection of Hutchison Drive and La Rue Road. The site is currently designated as PE/ICA/Recreation.

Conference Center and Hotel at First and A Streets - The conference center and hotel project would be constructed on Parking Lot 10 at the intersection of First and A Streets. The Graduate School of Management Building would be constructed and operated consistent with the proposed project.

Russell Boulevard and A Street Site Alternative – The proposed conference center would be constructed at the intersection of Russell Boulevard and A Street (i.e., Toomey Field). The Graduate School of Management Building would be constructed and operated consistent with the proposed project.

Detailed descriptions and analysis of potential impacts of these alternatives are presented in Chapter 6.

Several other alternatives were considered but rejected from further analysis. These alternatives include construction and operation of a:

- conference center and hotel on East Olive Drive in the City of Davis;
- conference center without a hotel on the Railroad Triangle (property adjacent to the UPRR station bordered by the railroad tracks) in the City of Davis;
- reduced-size conference center without a hotel in the parking lot area south of First Street across from the Hallmark Inn in the City of Davis;
- reduced size conference center without a hotel on the site of the former City of Davis police station on F Street between Second and Third Streets; and a
- conference center and hotel on the Nishi triangle property south of the campus (bordered by the UPRR tracks to the north and I-80 to the south).

A detailed discussion of these alternatives and why they were rejected from further analysis is also included in Chapter 6.

Summary Table

Table 2-1 provides a complete list of all impacts and mitigation measures for the topics evaluated in this Focused Tiered DEIR (land use and planning, traffic and circulation, noise, and biological resources). For each impact, the table presents the significance of the impact before mitigation, applicable project-specific mitigation and/or applicable 1994 LRDP EIR mitigation measures, and the level of significance of the impact after implementation of applicable mitigation measures.
3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Regional Location

The 5,300-acre UC Davis campus (the campus) is located in Yolo and Solano Counties approximately 72 miles northeast of San Francisco, 15 miles west of the City of Sacramento, and adjacent to the City of Davis (see Figure 3-1). The campus, in general, is comprised of four campus units: the central campus, the south campus, the west campus, and Russell Ranch (see Figure 3-2, Regional and Local Setting, on page 3-5 of the 1994 LRDP Draft EIR). The "main campus" refers to the central, south, and west campus units, excluding Russell Ranch. Most of the academic and extracurricular activities occur within the central campus. The central campus is bounded approximately by Russell Boulevard to the north, State Route 113 (SR 113) to the west, I-80 and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks to the south, and A Street to the east. The south campus is located south of I-80 and north of the South Fork of Putah Creek. The west campus is bounded by SR 113 to the east, Putah Creek to the south, Russell Boulevard to the north, and extends approximately one-half mile west of County Road 98. The south and west campus units are contiguous with the central campus and are used primarily for field teaching and research. The 1,590-acre Russell Ranch portion of the campus lies to the west, separated from the west campus by approximately one and one-half miles of privately owned agricultural land. Russell Ranch was acquired by the campus in 1990 and is intended for use in large-scale agricultural and environmental research and the study of sustainable agricultural practices. Russell Ranch is bordered roughly by County Road 96 on the east, Putah Creek on the south, Covell Boulevard on the north, and Russell Boulevard on the west and northwest. In addition, UC Davis owns several buildings in Research Park, located in the City of Davis south of I-80.

Project Site

The proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project site is located in the south entry area of the central campus. Land uses surrounding the proposed project site include the Robert and Margrit Mondavi Center for the Performing Arts (Center for the Performing Arts) and the South Entry Quad to the west, a portion of Parking Lot 1 to the south, Union Pacific Railroad tracks to the southeast, community gardens to the east, Department of Environmental Horticulture buildings and gardens to the north, and the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center to the northwest (see Figure 3-2).

The western portion of the project site is currently vacant of any structures. The eastern portion of the site is currently used by the Department of Environmental Horticulture for teaching and research field activities. The Administrative Annex trailers previously located this portion of the site were recently relocated as part of the Center for the Performing Arts and South Entry Roadway and Parking Improvements project. As discussed further below, Environmental
Horticulture teaching and research field activities located in this area would be relocated to the west campus on a parcel north of Hutchison Drive near the University Airport (see Figure 3-3). The 1994 LRDP land use designations for the Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project site, as amended, include High Density Academic and Administrative with Potential Enterprise Opportunity and Parking (see Amendments to the 1994 LRDP and Revisions to the 1994 LRDP EIR included as Appendix C of this DEIR). The proposed site for the relocated Environmental Horticulture teaching and research field activities is designated in the 1994 LRDP as Teaching and Research Fields. The proposed project is consistent with these land use designations.

**Project Description**

The proposed project includes construction and operation of a conference center facility, a hotel, and a building for the Graduate School of Management on approximately five acres in the south entry area of the central campus (see Figure 3-2). The conference center facility would comprise approximately 75,000 gsf (55,000 asf) and would accommodate conference center operations and office space for units within the Office of University Relations. The hotel would comprise approximately 40,000 gsf (28,000 asf) and would include 75 guest rooms. The Graduate School of Management Building would comprise 45,000 gsf (27,000 asf) and would accommodate space for the Graduate School of Management, units within the Office of University Relations, and Internship and Career Center. The project would also include associated open space and landscaping, and a 100-space parking area. In addition, Department of Environmental Horticulture teaching and research field activities currently located on about four acres of the five-acre project site would be relocated to the west campus on a parcel north of Hutchison Drive near the University Airport (see Figure 3-3). A greenhouse and an agricultural support building would be provided on less than two acres at this new site.

**Project Background and Need**

**Conference Center**

The campus currently does not have adequate space to host state, national, and international academic conferences for faculty researchers. The proposed conference center facility would be built according to the standards established by the International Association of Conference Centers, which relate to quality of service, amenities, meeting room design, food service, guest accommodations, and business mix. Conference space complying with these standards does not exist in the City of Davis. As a pre-eminent research and learning institution, UC Davis’ academic program depends on its ability to advance innovative research. The ability to host significant academic conferences and professional meetings on campus would substantially contribute to this campus mission and would facilitate interdisciplinary research and learning opportunities for all academic disciplines on campus. UC Davis’ ability to host meetings with strategic corporate, governmental, and non-profit partners who play an integral part in research efforts is also critical to the success of the UC Davis academic program. The existing meeting space on campus is insufficient to meet the current growing demand. In addition, the University Club has recently been partially converted to a dance studio so it currently offers less meeting space. Therefore, the ability of UC Davis’ faculty to host conferences and foster partnerships on
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campus is limited. The UC Davis campus is the ideal place for faculty to interact with other researchers and advance partnerships.

The proposed conference center would provide a state-of-the-art learning and meeting center where ideas and advances could be exchanged in a highly conducive environment. It would work in combination with the proposed hotel, adjacent Center for the Performing Arts (under construction), and existing Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center to enhance UC Davis' role as a regional center for the exchange of ideas. The conference center would meet current needs, stimulate future campus conference demand, attract campus affiliates, and draw from the growing regional corporate market. The proposed conference center would also enhance visitor attraction to the local community.

The UC Davis Office of University Relations works with the campus community and external constituencies to provide leadership in building public understanding and support for UC Davis and its mission. Office space provided in the proposed conference center, as well as in the proposed Graduate School of Management Building, would help consolidate existing University Relations units that are currently located on- and off-campus and would provide space for expected growth in these units. University Relations units that would move to office space in the proposed conference center facility and Graduate School of Management Building include on-campus units (including the Office of the Vice Chancellor/Associate Vice Chancellor currently located in Mrak Hall, Public Communications currently located in Mrak Hall, Government and Community Relations currently located in Mrak Hall and the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center) and units currently located in off-campus leased space (including Advancement Services, Development, and Resource Management). In addition, the Internship and Career Center that is currently located in the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center would also move to new office space provided by the project.

Hotel

There is substantial nationwide competition for hosting academic conferences. For the campus and the Davis community to accrue the benefits of such conferences, the proposed conference center facility must successfully compete with other similar facilities around the country. Integral to the success of the proposed conference center is the proposed hotel, which would provide adjacent lodging with amenities to meet the needs of conference attendees. Conference planners, for academic conference in particular, seek conference facilities that adequately provides for multi-day conferences. The proposed hotel would be essential to complete the full-service meeting environment and would be critical to the success of this type of regional center. In addition, revenue generated from operating the proposed hotel would make the conference center facility financially viable. Without this revenue, a conference center operation would be less likely to fund the project and all of its proposed design standards and amenities. As a unit, the Conference Center and Hotel would substantially contribute to the UC Davis academic program. The proposed hotel would also function in conjunction with the proposed conference center, existing Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center, and Center for the Performing Arts (under construction) to enhance UC Davis' role as a regional center for the exchange of ideas.
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Graduate School of Management Building

The Graduate School of Management currently occupies approximately 10,500 asf in Academic Office Building 4 (AOB 4) located on the central campus east of Olson Hall and west of A Street. This building cannot adequately accommodate the department's current and projected needs. The Graduate School of Management curriculum is evolving to keep up with current trends. New Graduate School of Management courses include E-commerce and Marketing, Gender Issues in Management, New Product Development, and Health Care Management. In addition, the Graduate School of Management academic plan proposes a new Technology Management Minor, a Distance Learning teaching program, and an East Bay Weekend MBA program.

AOB 4 contains approximately 15,500 asf, and is occupied by the Graduate School of Management and the Communication Department. Although the space currently occupied by the Communication Department (approximately 5,000 asf) could provide some expansion room for Graduate School of Management, this space would not adequately accommodate long-term program needs. AOB 4 does not have adequate and well-designed classroom space; the building was originally built to provide offices only, and it was subsequently renovated to accommodate only two small, minimally configured classrooms. In addition, AOB 4 does not offer effective student gathering or event space, and the building is ill-suited for renovation because it has a narrow double-loaded corridor layout. Furthermore, the Graduate School of Management requires more technically advanced space to keep up with evolving program needs. The proposed building would fully address the Graduate School of Management's demands for new space.

As discussed above, office space in the proposed Graduate School of Management Building and conference center facility would help consolidate on- and off-campus units within the UC Davis Office of University Relations. In addition, this space would accommodate expected growth within these units. The Graduate School of Management Building would also provide space for the Internship and Career Center, which currently uses space in the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center.

Project Objectives

The campus has identified the following objectives for the proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project:

- provide a venue for state, national, and international academic conferences on the campus;
- provide an opportunity to host visitors, alumni, and the business community;
- add to UC Davis’ role as a regional academic and arts center and meeting place in combination with the adjacent Center for the Performing Arts (currently under construction) and Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center;
- ensure that the conference center and hotel are financially viable operations;
• provide adequate space for future growth of the Graduate School of Management;

• provide access and exposure to the broader community for the conference center, hotel, and the Graduate School of Management;

• provide space for growth and consolidation of office space for a major portion of the Office of University Relations;

• consolidate Office of University Relations operations at a site that facilitates easy access by faculty, other campus groups, and external constituencies; and

• provide outdoor gathering areas and landscaped pedestrian walkways that link to adjacent uses including the Center for the Performing Arts and the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center.

Project Elements

As shown in Figure 3-4, the proposed conference center facility would be located on the west side of the project site, facing the South Entry Quad. This three-story building would include the conference/hotel lobby, a small gift shop, a restaurant, a pub, a ballroom, pre-function space, support space, and meeting rooms on the ground floor. Office space would be provided on the two stories above the meeting rooms. The three-story hotel would be located centrally within the project site, east of the conference center facility and southwest of the Graduate School of Management Building. A covered walkway and a large courtyard would join the conference center facility and the hotel. The three-story Graduate School of Management Building would be located northeast of the hotel. A courtyard and pedestrian connections to the core campus would be provided to the north of this building. The parking area would be located to the east of the hotel and south of the Graduate School of Management Building, and vehicle access would be provided off the realigned Old Davis Road (under construction) to the south. Figure 3-5 presents a rendering of the west side of the conference center building.

Conference Center

The conference center facility would occupy approximately 1.5 acres. The proposed conference center facility would consist of approximately 75,000 gsf (55,000 asf), and would include a restaurant and pub; lobby, gift shop, and pre-function space; a ballroom; support space; meeting rooms; and office space (see Figure 3-4). Conference center uses, including the restaurant and pub, ballroom, meeting rooms, lobby and pre-function space, and support space would occupy the ground floor of the facility (see Figure 3-4). Office space would occupy two stories above the conference center's meeting rooms.

The conference center facility would include the following spaces:

• **Food Service** - The facility would include an approximately 4,000-asf food service area including an approximately 75-person capacity restaurant, and an approximately 75-person capacity pub.
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- **Lobby, Gift Shop, and Pre-function Space** - The facility would include approximately 8,000 asf for a lobby, a small gift shop, guest support space, and a conference center pre-function area. The lobby would serve both the conference center and the hotel.

- **Ballroom** - The facility would include an approximately 5,000-asf ballroom with meeting capacity for 500 people and dining capacity for approximately 300 people.

- **Meeting Rooms** - The facility would include meeting rooms and meeting support space totaling approximately 8,000 asf with capacity for 300 people. Rooms in the adjacent Center for the Performing Arts and Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center would provide additional meeting space for the conference center facility.

- **Support Space** - The facility would include approximately 10,000 asf of space to accommodate support operations including: kitchen and kitchen storage; receiving; storage; employee offices, lounge, and lockers; laundry and housekeeping services; and engineering and mechanical uses.

- **Office Space** - Office space and associated lobby and meeting rooms would total approximately 20,000 asf and would be located in two stories above the conference center meeting rooms and lobby. This office space would serve the Office of University Relations.

**Hotel**

The hotel building would occupy approximately one acre. The hotel would be a three-story building and would include 40,000 gsf (28,000 asf). The hotel would consist of 75 guest rooms (including some suites), interior walkways, a lobby, elevator space, and an outdoor pool.

**Graduate School of Management Building**

The Graduate School of Management Building would occupy approximately one acre. The three-story building would consist of 45,000 gsf (27,000 asf) and would include classrooms, offices, student activity space, and special use/support areas. The Graduate School of Management would occupy two floors in the building (approximately 18,000 asf), and units within the Office of University Relations and/or the Internship and Career Center would occupy one floor (approximately 9,000 asf). The Graduate School of Management program could eventually grow to occupy the entire Graduate School of Management Building. Physical changes associated with future accommodation of Office of University Relations units elsewhere would be addressed in a separate environmental review if and when proposed.

The Graduate School of Management Building would include the following spaces:

- **Classrooms** - The Graduate School of Management Building would include approximately 7,000 asf for classroom space. The building would have approximately 12 classrooms, including four major classrooms with approximately 35, 55, 75, and 100 seats and eight smaller break-out rooms.
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- **Offices** - The Graduate School of Management Building would include approximately 14,000 asf for faculty and staff office space.

- **Student Activity Space** - The building would offer approximately 2,000 asf for student activity space, including student lockers, a student lounge, and offices and storage space for student organizations.

- **Special Use/Support Areas** - Approximately 4,000 asf would be used for special use and support, including a computer lab, conference room, storage space, and lobby/event space.

**Acoustical Design**

Because the project site is near the UPRR line and I-80, specific acoustical attenuation features would be incorporated into project design, including the following: (1) locating guest rooms at a minimum of 200 feet from the railroad line, (2) locating other sound sensitive uses as far from the railroad line as feasible, (3) locating less sound-sensitive uses between the railroad line and sensitive uses to act as a buffer, (4) using construction materials and techniques (including ratio of glass to solid wall) to reduce interior sound to acceptable levels.

**Parking and Circulation**

The proposed project would provide approximately 100 surface parking spaces on approximately 0.75 acre within the project site. These spaces would be available for use by overnight hotel guests, restaurant and pub patrons, and a limited number of Graduate School of Management and University Relations visitors. The proposed parking area would be located to the east of the hotel and south of the Graduate School of Management Building (see Figure 3-4). The proposed project’s 100-space parking lot would be designed and built to campus standards. Trees would be planted to provide shade for 50 percent of the parking lot surface after 15 years of growth, and adequate lighting would be provided.

The south entry area of campus offers a total of 1,576 permit parking spaces that would accommodate employees associated with the project. Approximately 75 existing parking spaces in Parking Lot 1 (off the project site and immediately south) would be made available as needed for overnight hotel guests and restaurant and pub patrons. Parking for conference attendees would be available in existing visitor parking spaces near the proposed project site, including approximately 785 visitor and permit surface parking spaces in Parking Lots 1 and 2 (approximately 638 remaining spaces in Lot 1 and the 147 spaces in Lot 2). In addition, parking would be available as needed for conference attendees in the South Entry Parking Structure, which offers 716 permit parking spaces for visitors on weekends and after 5:00 p.m. on weekdays. With special arrangements, visitor spaces in this structure could also be available before 5:00 p.m. on weekdays.

To meet periods of high parking demand, UC Davis Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) could implement attendant-assisted parking (i.e., stacked parking) for Parking Lots 1 and 2, and the South Entry Parking Structure on an as-needed basis. Attendant-assisted parking would accommodate approximately 219 additional vehicles in Parking Lot 1, 60 additional vehicles in Parking Lot 2, and 257 additional vehicles in the South Entry Parking Structure.
When the project begins operation, the realigned Old Davis Road (currently under construction) would traverse from its current alignment at the Information Kiosk, along the south side of the Center for the Performing Arts, the South Entry Quad, and the proposed project site, to the proposed parking area. The realigned Old Davis Road would provide access to the road encircling the South Entry Quad. This South Entry Quad roadway would provide on-street short-term parking and access to the conference center lobby.

Pedestrian pathways would be provided within the project area to connect building elements. Major pedestrian paths would be designed to accommodate emergency vehicle access to the proposed buildings. A pedestrian sidewalk would be provided on the streetfront edge of the proposed project facing the South Entry Quad. Bicycle parking would be provided at each corner of the South Entry Quad as part of the Center for the Arts Performance Hall project design. Parking would also be provided immediately adjacent to the Graduate School of Management Building.

Access to the Environmental Horticulture teaching and research fields replacement site would be provided off Hutchison Drive (see Figure 3-3). A small graveled parking area would be provided on the site, adjacent to the proposed greenhouse and agricultural support building.

**Open Space and Landscaping**

Approximately 0.75 acre of open space areas and landscaping would be provided between and around the conference center facility, the hotel, and the Graduate School of Management Building. A large courtyard would serve as an organizing element between the conference center facility and hotel. The project would integrate new development with existing outdoor open spaces and the Environmental Horticulture gardens to the north by providing consistent landscaping and pathway connections. There would be a public entry area facing the South Entry Quad along the west side of the facility. Landscaping would be accomplished consistent with existing landscaping on campus and would include plantings of trees, shrubs, groundcover, and lawns. Water features like ponds and fountains could also be included.

**Lighting and Glare**

Lighting would be provided on the exterior of the buildings, along pedestrian pathways, and in the project's parking area. Lighting could also be provided as part of the project's landscape features. The exterior walls of the proposed buildings would use low glare producing materials. Passive solar treatment would be provided, as appropriate.

**Utilities and Infrastructure**

The proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building Project would require connections to campus utilities and infrastructure including domestic/fire water, utility water, sewer, storm drainage, electricity, and telecommunications. Natural gas service would not be supplied through the campus system, but would be secured by the developer from PG&E. The capacities of these utility systems are analyzed in Section 16, Utilities and Service...
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Systems, of the attached Environmental Checklist (Appendix A). Proposed routes for utility connections are summarized below.

*Domestic/Fire water* - The proposed project would connect to the campus domestic water system at a point located approximately 70 feet southwest of the proposed project site. The project would connect to a ten-inch diameter water main that was installed under the realigned Old Davis Road as part of the Center for the Performing Arts project. An existing six-inch domestic water line that crosses a portion of the site would need to be removed, relocated, or abandoned in place. In addition, a service extension to a six-inch main serving the fire hydrant in the Environmental Horticulture complex (to the north of the project site) would be installed.

*Utility water* - The project would connect to the campus utility water system at a point located either to the north or the east of the future South Entry Quad under the realigned Old Davis Road (currently under construction). Utility water would be used to irrigate the proposed project's approximately 0.75 acre of new open space and landscaped grounds.

*Sanitary sewer* - The project would connect to the campus sanitary sewer system at a point located to the southeast of the future South Entry Quad under the realigned Old Davis Road. The project would connect to an eight-inch diameter line that was installed as part of the Center for the Performing Arts project.

*Storm drainage* - The proposed project would connect to the campus storm drainage collection system at a point located southwest of the project site. A new line would be installed from the point of connection to the project site.

*Electricity* - The proposed project would connect to the campus electrical system at a point located southeast of the project site under the realigned Old Davis Road. At this point the project would connect to a new electrical extension constructed to serve the Center for the Performing Arts.

*Telecommunications* - The proposed project would connect to an existing campus telecommunication line at a point located under Mrak Hall Drive. In addition, the project could connect to a private telecommunications service via a wireless connection.

*Natural gas* - The developer of the proposed project would secure natural gas service from PG&E and would not connect to the campus natural gas infrastructure. The project would connect to the PG&E main line along the Union Pacific rail line, which traverses approximately 200 feet south of the project site.

The proposed structures at the Environmental Horticulture teaching and research fields site would connect to the campus electrical, domestic water, and sanitary sewer systems. The buildings would connect to an overhead electrical line located off Hutchison Drive to the south. The buildings would connect to an underground domestic water line located under Hutchison Drive near the intersection of Hopkins Road (to the southwest). The sewer connection would be under Hutchison Drive to the south. The replacement teaching and research fields site is currently served by an adequate agricultural water connection.
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Population

As discussed further below, the proposed project would accommodate employees associated with the operation of the conference center facility and hotel, Graduate School of Management faculty and staff, and employees in the Office of University Relations. The proposed project would add approximately 375 employees to the campus population. New employees to the campus would include those directly associated with the proposed project and those who would fill space vacated by existing employees who would be relocated to the project. Of these employees, approximately 335 employees could be on the project site at any given time.

Conference Center Facility and Hotel

Operation of the conference center facility and the hotel would require a total of approximately 100 employees. Of these employees, approximately 60 would be on-site at any given time.

Graduate School of Management

The Graduate School of Management would move its current faculty and staff (a total of approximately 75 people) from AOB 4 to the proposed Graduate School of Management Building. Space vacated in AOB 4 would be reoccupied by growth in other campus programs. Therefore, for the purposes of this analysis, the proposed project would contribute 75 new employees to the campus population associated with the Graduate School of Management.

Office of University Relations

Approximately 200 existing and new staff in the Office of University Relations and Internship and Career Center would occupy office space in the conference center facility and the Graduate School of Management Building. The proposed project would accommodate employees in the following on-campus University Relations units: the Vice Chancellor/Associate Vice Chancellor (provides management of University Relations) currently located in Mrak Hall; and Public Communications (provides communication services for the campus community and the general public) and Government and Community Relations (provides leadership and coordination of local, state and federal support and advocacy of the campus mission) currently located in Mrak Hall and the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center. In addition, the Internship and Career Center, which provides career guidance to students and alumni, would move from its current location in the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center to new office space provided by the project. Space vacated in the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center would be reoccupied by growth in alumni programs. Space vacated in Mrak Hall would be reoccupied by growth in other campus programs. The project would also accommodate employees in the following off-campus University Relations units: Advancement Services (provides central information systems, processing services, gift policy administration); Development (provides leadership, support and coordination of fund raising campaigns, ceremonies and special events); and Resources Management (provides administrative support to University Relations). University Relations staff that would relocate from off-campus leased space in Davis would be considered new additions to the on-campus population because off-campus leased space could be reoccupied by growth in other campus programs, and occupation of off-campus space is considered as part of the total-campus population. Therefore, for the purpose of this analysis, the proposed project
would contribute 200 new employees to the campus population associated with the Office of University Relations and Internship and Career Center.

**Relocated Environmental Horticulture Activities**

The proposed project would displace Department of Environmental Horticulture teaching and research activities currently located on and adjacent to the eastern portion of the project site (the Environmental Horticulture Buildings and garden to the north would remain). The campus is currently proposing to relocate these activities to existing teaching and research fields in the west campus, located north of Hutchison Drive near the University Airport (see Figure 3-3). This land is currently used by the Agronomy Department for activities they will discontinue. Other Environmental Horticulture activities currently taking place in the south campus (south of I-80 and west of Old Davis Road) would also be consolidated at this new location. In addition, the project would provide an approximately 3,000-square-foot headhouse/storage building, an approximately 3,000-square-foot enclosed greenhouse, and a small gravel parking area on less than two acres. This use is consistent with the site's Teaching and Research Fields land use designation in the 1994 LRDP.

**Construction Schedule and Staging**

All construction staging and contractor parking associated with the proposed project would occur on the proposed project site. If the project is approved, construction is expected to occur from fall 2002 to spring 2004.

**Project Approvals**

As a public agency principally responsible for approving or carrying out the proposed project, The Regents is the Lead Agency under CEQA, and is responsible for reviewing and certifying the adequacy of the environmental document and approving the proposed project. It is anticipated that The Regents will consider design, lease, and finance approval of the proposed project in March 2002. In addition, The Regents will consider amending the 1994 LRDP land use designation of two acres of Support use in the west campus to Teaching and Research Fields, as proposed in Mitigation Measure 4.5-1.

Operation of the proposed project’s emergency stand-by diesel-fired generators would require an Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate from the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD).

A New Construction Project Information Form and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan subject to California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) standards would also be required.
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Introduction

In accordance with Sections 15063 and 15082 of the CEQA guidelines, the campus published a Tiered Initial Study and NOP that were circulated for public and agency review from August 17, 2001 through September 17, 2001. The Tiered Initial Study and NOP is included as Appendix A of this DEIR.

Based on the analysis in the Tiered Initial Study, it has been determined that further analysis is required for a complete evaluation of impacts to certain resource areas. Therefore, this Focused Tiered EIR analyzes the significance of impacts to those environmental resource areas and develops project-specific mitigation measures, as necessary.

Scope of the EIR

The Environmental Analysis section of this EIR discusses the environmental setting, impacts and mitigation measures for each of the following topics:

- **Land Use and Planning** - physical changes in the City of Davis that could result from the economic impact of operating the proposed conference center and hotel, and potential conflicts with the City of Davis General Plan;

- **Transportation and Circulation** - impacts from increased vehicle trips and parking demand;

- **Noise** - increased noise levels associated with increased vehicle trips; and

- **Biological Resources** – potential loss of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat.

Issues Addressed in the Initial Study

The analysis contained in the Tiered Initial Study concluded that impacts in the following issue areas would be either less than significant, less than significant after incorporation of mitigation measures included in the 1994 LRDP EIR (please see Appendix A for a complete list of 1994 LRDP Mitigation Measures incorporated into the proposed project), or significant and unavoidable as identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR for which no new mitigation measures are available and no new analysis is proposed:

- Agricultural Resources
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- Population and Housing
- Air Quality
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Geology and Soils
- Mineral Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Aesthetics
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Utilities and Service Systems

**Approach to Environmental Analysis**

Sections 4.2 through 4.5 include discussions of the environmental and regulatory setting, standards of significance, impacts, and mitigation measures. The environmental setting addresses the conditions that exist prior to implementation of the proposed project and provides a point of reference (or baseline) for assessing the environmental impacts of the proposed project and alternatives. Each impact and mitigation measure discussion includes an impact statement, an explanation of the impact (as it relates to the proposed project), an analysis of the significance of the impact, description of relevant mitigation measures, and an evaluation of whether the identified mitigation measures would reduce the magnitude of identified impacts. Each impact statement is assigned a number based on the section and the order they appear (for example, 4.1-1, 4.1-2, etc). Mitigation measures for each impact are numbered consistent with the impact statement they apply to (for example 4.1-1(a), 4.1-1(b), 4.1-2, etc).

This DEIR incorporates by reference, as appropriate, the environmental analysis of the 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised. Amendments to the 1994 LRDP and revisions to the 1994 LRDP EIR (through November 2001) are included as Appendix C of this DEIR. Mitigation measures identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised, that apply to the proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building Project, will be required to be implemented as part of the project. These mitigation measures are identified and discussed in the Tiered Initial Study (see Appendix A of this DEIR) and in Sections 4.2 through 4.5 of this DEIR.
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Introduction

The analysis in this section evaluates the extent to which the proposed conference center and hotel could result in potential physical deterioration of the Davis downtown area by affecting the economic performance of Davis lodging facilities and the project’s consistency with the updated City of Davis General Plan. The project’s Tiered Initial Study (Appendix A of this DEIR) determined that the proposed project would not conflict with the 1994 LRDP, the applicable land use plan for the campus. The Tiered Initial Study also concluded that the proposed project would not physically divide an established community, that it would not conflict with applicable habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans, and that it would not propose uses that would conflict with adjacent existing or future land uses. The Tiered Initial Study prepared for the proposed project adequately addressed these issues.

Relevant land use information, including applicable environmental and regulatory setting and standards of significance identified in Section 4.1 of the 1994 LRDP DEIR and in Item I of the Center for the Arts Performance Hall and South Entry Roadway and Parking Improvements Tiered Initial Study and Negative Declaration are incorporated by reference and summarized below, as appropriate (see Amendments to the 1994 LRDP and Revisions and Updates to the 1994 LRDP EIR [November 2001] included as Appendix C of this DEIR). In 1998, as part of the Center for the Arts Performance Hall and South Entry Roadway and Parking Improvements Project, The Regents amended the 1994 LRDP land use designation of the project site by adding Potential Enterprise Opportunity to the site’s High Density Academic and Administrative designation.

The description of existing conditions and potential impacts related to the Davis lodging market is summarized from a report by Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. titled UC Davis Hotel and Conference Center/Impact on Lodging Facilities in the City of Davis, which is included in Appendix E of this DEIR. Three other economic studies are included as attachments to the Keyser Marston Associates report presented in Appendix E of this DEIR: Report of the Potential Impact on the Existing Lodging Market from the Development of a Proposed 150-Room Conference Center to be Located at UC Davis by PKF Consulting (Attachment A to Appendix E), and Adaptive Reuse of Davis Lodging Facilities by Keyser Marston Associates (Attachment B to Appendix E), and Impact of the Proposed Conference Center Development by PKF Consulting (Attachment C to Appendix E). The methods used by Keyser Marston Associates to establish baseline conditions are presented in “Existing Market Performance,” below. Methods used to evaluate potential effects of the proposed project on the local lodging market are described in Impact 4.2-1 presented later in this section.
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Environmental Setting

The following section describes existing conditions related to campus land use planning, existing conditions related to City of Davis land use planning, and existing conditions related to the commercial lodging market in Davis.

UC Davis

The 5,300-acre UC Davis campus, in general, is comprised of four campus units: the central campus, the south campus, the west campus, and Russell Ranch (please see Figure 3-2, Regional and Local Setting, on page 3-5 of the 1994 LRDP DEIR). The proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project site is located in the south entry area of the central campus. The western portion of the site is currently free of structures. The eastern portion of the site is currently used by the Department of Environmental Horticulture for teaching and research field activities.

1994 LRDP Land Use Designation

The 1994 LRDP land use designations for the proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project site, as amended, include High Density Academic and Administrative with Potential Enterprise Opportunity and Parking. Environmental Horticulture activities currently using land on the eastern portion of the site would be relocated to fields in the west campus north of Hutchison Drive near the University Airport, a site designated in the 1994 LRDP for Teaching and Research Fields.

The following briefly summarizes uses associated with each 1994 LRDP land use designation relevant to the proposed project.

Academic and Administrative – The majority of existing High Density Academic and Administrative facilities are located in the central campus. Uses include classrooms; research laboratories and research support areas; faculty, student and staff offices; and libraries.

Enterprise Reserves – This land use designation signifies that campus development in these areas would primarily be financed in cooperation with public or private organizations external to the campus. Uses include those that support the academic mission of the campus.

Parking and Circulation – Parking, roadways and bicycle paths are found throughout the campus. Parking and bicycle paths are concentrated on the core of the central campus.

Teaching/Research Fields – A majority of the west campus, south campus and Russell Ranch consists of lands used for field research and instructional purposes. This land use category includes agricultural lands and associated support structures for teaching, research, and support of academic programs.

Uses allowed under the High Density Academic and Administrative designation (defined on pages 45 and 46 of the 1994 LRDP) include those that support and advance the instruction and research mission of the campus. The designation allows for buildings up to nine stories high, including classrooms, research laboratories, and research support areas, student and staff offices, and libraries. In addition, this land use designation includes space for student activities, museums, administrative offices, meeting rooms, and public service activities linked to the
campus. Existing High Density Academic and Administrative space on campus includes a variety of venues that generate revenue and are open to the general public, including those in the Memorial Union (the Coffee House, the campus Bookstore and computer shop, and a bowling alley) and in the Silo (Silo Pub and Café, Taco Bell, Carl's Jr., Pizza Hut, Sub-City Sandwiches, and Starbucks). These venues are consistent with the High Density Academic and Administrative designation because they support the campus's instruction and research mission. Similarly, the proposed conference center and hotel would be open to the general public, would be revenue-generating in nature, and would support the campus’ instruction and research mission. As discussed in Chapter 3 of this DEIR in the subsection titled “Project Background and Need,” the proposed conference center and hotel would accommodate academic conferences and professional meetings, thereby substantially contributing to UC Davis' academic program.

The Potential Enterprise Opportunity overlay (defined on page 46 of the 1994 LRDP) can be applied over various land use categories and signifies that associated development will be primarily financed in cooperation with entities external to the campus. Enterprise areas are intended to provide the flexibility for academic and administrative units to respond to initiatives that further the academic mission. In addition, as indicated on page 67 of the 1994 LRDP, Enterprise activities include “projects that benefit campus academic programs by hosting public or private research and outreach activities on campus land.” Consistent with this overlay, the proposed project would be partially funded by a development partnership with a private entity, and it would further the academic mission by hosting academic conferences.

The 1994 LRDP defines the Parking land use designation as surface and structure lots with 100 spaces or more. The parking component of the proposed project would be consistent with the site’s Parking designation.

The proposed conference center, hotel, and Graduate School of Management building would, therefore, be consistent with the project site’s High Density Academic and Administrative with Potential Enterprise Opportunity and Parking land use designations.

Environmental Horticulture teaching and research fields activities currently located on the site would be relocated to the west campus on a parcel designated as Teaching and Research Fields in the 1994 LRDP. The Teaching and Research Fields designation includes agricultural lands used for teaching, research, and support of academic programs, and it may include “agricultural-related” buildings on sites smaller than two acres. Relocated Environmental Horticulture activities would be consistent with this land use designation.

The five-acre Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project site is surrounded by campus land to the east, north, northwest and south. The 1994 LRDP land use designations adjacent to the Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project site include High Density Academic and Administrative to the north, Formal Open Space to the west, Community Gardens to the northeast, and Parking to the south (see Figure 1 in Appendix C). Adjacent campus land uses include the Robert and Margrit Mondavi Center for the Performing Arts (Center for the Performing Arts) and the South Entry Quad to the west, a portion of Parking Lot 1 to the south, Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks to the southeast, community gardens to the east, Department of Environmental Horticulture buildings and gardens to the northeast, and the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center to the northwest (see Figure 3-2). The area to the south of the UPRR tracks consists of privately owned agricultural
fields in Yolo County. These agricultural fields are currently zoned by the City of Davis as Urban Reserve. There are no existing or planned roads or infrastructure connecting the campus to this off-campus land.

Environmental Horticulture activities currently using land on the eastern portion of the project site would be relocated to fields in the west campus located north of Hutchison Drive near the University Airport (see Figure 3-3). The proposed site for the relocated Environmental Horticulture activities is currently used by the Agronomy Department for field studies that will be discontinued, and is designated in the 1994 LRDP as Teaching and Research Fields. Campus teaching and research fields border the site.

**City of Davis**

The City of Davis (the City) borders the campus on the majority of its eastern and northern boundaries. The City of Davis Core Area borders the central campus along First Street to D Street and along A Street. Current uses in the Core Area primarily include single and multifamily residences and one- to two-story commercial establishments. As shown in Figure 4.1-4 on page 4.1-22 in the 1994 LRDP DEIR, existing City land use designations adjacent to the campus include Residential, Retail Stores, and Retail with Offices (which may include multifamily housing). Until amended in 1995, the City’s previous General Plan included a shopping center/conference hotel on land that was previously campus property on the south side of First Street between D Street and the Richards Boulevard undercrossing. However, because this land was campus land, the 1994 LRDP was the applicable land use plan for this parcel and not the City of Davis General Plan. The 1994 LRDP designated this land for commercial use. The parcel was subsequently annexed by the City and developed exclusively for retail uses, and the 2001 updated City of Davis General Plan designates the now-developed location as Retail with Offices.¹

The proposed project site is located in the Davis Planning Area. Although the University of California is exempt from local plans, policies and zoning regulations, it is the campus’ policy to cooperate with the General Plans and land use policies of the City of Davis (1994 LRDP DEIR page 4.2-19). Relevant City of Davis policies are discussed below. A discussion of consistency with relevant City policies is provided in Impact 4.2-2, below.

**City of Davis General Plan**

An update to the City’s General Plan was adopted in May 2001. The following discussion summarizes the goals and policies identified in the update that are relevant to the proposed project.

Goal ED 1 of the updated General Plan’s Economic and Business Development Element strives to maintain and enhance the Core Area as a vibrant, healthy downtown that serves as the city’s social, cultural and entertainment center and primary, but not exclusive, retail and business district. The following policy relevant to the proposed project is identified to implement Goal ED 1:

Policy ED 1.1 Increase attractions and amenities that bring people to the Core, including local shopping, services, modest tourism, specialty retail, restaurants, festivals/special events, farmers’ market and entertainment.
Goal ED 2 of the updated General Plan’s Economic and Business Development Element addresses attracting visitors to Davis. The following policy is identified to fulfill Goal ED 2:

Policy ED 2.1 Promote Davis as a destination for visitors with interests in eco-tourism, university/academic events and conferences, athletic events, culture and arts, and downtown shopping.

Goal ED 3 seeks to retain existing businesses and encourage new ones as a means to increase higher paying jobs, create greater job diversification, and create a more balanced economy for all economic segments of the community, while also maintaining the City’s fiscal and environmental integrity. The following policy relevant to the proposed project is identified to fulfill Goal ED 3:

Policy ED 3.2 Encourage new businesses to locate in Davis, targeting businesses which improve the City’s fiscal base, are consistent with the City’s values and identity, and match the employment skills of the population, such as those in the emerging technology and knowledge-based industries.

Economic Development Strategic Plan

In 1995, the Davis City Council adopted an Economic Development Strategic Plan: A Vision for 1995 to 2000, which identified numerous goals and objectives designed to expand the economic base of the community. Such goals included: attracting and retaining commercial and industrial enterprises that would contribute to the City's tax base and provide jobs appropriate for the community; preserving and enhancing the downtown as the community's cultural, retail, and business center; and attracting targeted visitors. The following goals and objectives from the Economic Development Strategic Plan: A Vision for 1995 to 2000 are relevant to the proposed project:

Visitor Attraction Strategy

Goal 1 Develop a program to attract targeted visitors to the community in order to increase retail sales, transient occupancy tax, and provide jobs.

Business Attraction Strategy

Objective 1.5 Develop UC Davis “symposiums” inviting targeted firms to Davis for specialized educational events to be co-sponsored by UC Davis.

An update to the 1995-2000 Economic Development Strategic Plan is currently underway; however, a new plan has not yet been adopted by the City. The update recognizes that the Visitor Attraction Program has been initiated, and future efforts are directed at monitoring program activities and continued implementation.  

City of Davis Core Area Strategy Report and Five-Year Action Plan

According to the City of Davis Core Area Strategy Report and Five-Year Action Plan (February 2000), the City loses an estimated $144 million a year in retail sales to stores in Sacramento. The City has expressed a strong desire to retain and attract retail and office uses to downtown Davis, as reflected in policies and implementing actions identified in the Core Area Strategy...
Report and Five-Year Action Plan and in policies presented in the 2001 City of Davis Draft General Plan Economic and Business Development Element. The Downtown Davis Business Association (DDBA) estimated the downtown commercial vacancy rate in 1999 to be less than 1 percent.\textsuperscript{3}

The Davis City Council adopted the Core Area Strategy Report and Five-Year Action Plan in February 2000. The report presents a vision for the development, enhancement, and preservation of the Downtown Core Area, and identifies policies and actions to encourage economic growth while maintaining the small-town charm and quality of downtown life. The plan addresses four key areas: economic vitality; urban design; community enrichment; and transportation, circulation, and parking. In addition to specific policies and actions intended to ensure the economic vitality of retail business, the following policy is of particular relevance to the proposed project:

**Economic Vitality – Visitor Attraction**

Promoting Davis as a destination for eco-tourism, university/academic events, conferences and athletic events.

**Existing Conditions and Projections for the Davis Lodging Market**

**Supply and Fiscal Performance**

The existing supply of lodging accommodations in Davis is comprised of nine standard hotels, one budget motel, and two bed and breakfast inns. Because the budget motel caters to a price-sensitive market and the bed and breakfast inns cater to a specialty niche, this analysis focuses on the nine standard hotels that would be competitive with the proposed hotel. The nine competitive lodging facilities have a total annual occupancy potential of 189,900 room nights and account for about 80 to 85 percent of the lodging industry in the City of Davis.

Based on discussions with local hoteliers and late September 2001 and a review of transient occupancy tax data from the City of Davis, the estimated composite annual occupancy level in 2001 for the nine standard lodging facilities was approximately 58.0 percent, with an average daily room rate of approximately $77.00 per night, representing minor upward movement in total room revenue from the previous year. These results are generally consistent with, although not identical to, trends in the larger Sacramento hotel market, which show a slight increase in room rate and slight decline in occupancy for the first seven months of 2001 compared to the same period in 2000.

Given the increase in transient occupancy tax receipts, these estimates may underestimate the performance of Davis hotels. According to the City of Davis, transient occupancy tax receipts for fiscal year (FY) 2000-01 were $861,125, compared to $704,458 for the FY 1999-2000, representing a 22.2 percent increase. Much of the increase appears attributable to one of the hotels, the Comfort Inn, which had its first full operating year in FY 2000-01. The balance appears attributable to a minor improvement in market conditions.

The overall increase of 22.2 percent in transient occupancy tax receipts indicates a positive trend in the hotel business in the City of Davis during the last decade. Transient occupancy tax...
receipts have increased from $316,757 in 1990-91 to $861,125 in 2000-2001. Over the 10-year period, room receipts have nearly tripled. The average annual change from year to year has been an increase of 10.9 percent, far outpacing inflation over that same period.\textsuperscript{4}

**Demand**

The demand for rooms in a market can be categorized in one of three ways: demonstrated or \textit{accommodated demand} (demand that can be quantified as existing occupancy levels at competitive hotels); \textit{unsatisfied demand} (demand that seeks accommodations in the competitive market, but is turned away due to non-availability of rooms); and \textit{induced demand} (demand that does not presently seek accommodations in the competitive market, but could be persuaded to do so through new hotel supply, marketing efforts, room rates, location, services, and amenities). Approximately 60 percent of the total accommodated demand in the City of Davis is generated from individuals visiting UC Davis or attending activities associated with UC Davis.\textsuperscript{5}

The demand for lodging in the Davis market consists of the commercial/transient market, group demand, and leisure demand. The commercial/transient market is the largest segment, which generates approximately 62 percent of the lodging demand in the Davis market. This segment is comprised primarily of visitors to local companies, independent sales people, employees in training, and other business people associated with UC Davis and business firms in the area. The demand for rooms in this segment is at its peak Monday through Thursday.

Group demand for the local market is composed of three types of segments: campus conferences; corporate group meetings; and social, military, educational, religious, and fraternal meetings. Due to the limited meeting facilities offered by City of Davis lodging properties, group meeting demand is estimated at approximately 6 percent of the total demand for the properties. Surveys of UC Davis meeting personnel conducted by campus staff in coordination with Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. in 1998 indicated an unmet demand for more than 28,000 room nights for conference and group meeting facilities. Thus, the unmet demand slightly exceeds the annual occupancy potential (27,375 room nights per year) for the hotel component of the proposed project.

Leisure travel includes out-of-area individuals who visit friends and family in Davis, local residents using the facilities for weekend getaways, and special events, such as weddings. Leisure demand occurs almost entirely during the weekend, Friday through Sunday, and tends to be highest in summer and fall months. Leisure demand accounts for approximately 32 percent of the total demand in the City of Davis.\textsuperscript{6}

**Projected Market Performance Without the Project (Baseline)**

There are no new lodging developments currently under construction or planned in the Davis market area other than the proposed project. The projected conditions in the lodging market in the City of Davis for the period from 2001 to 2008, as measured by gross room revenue (a key indicator) without the proposed project, are shown in Table 4.2-1.

As indicated in Table 4.2-1, the existing lodging market in Davis for the nine competitive lodging facilities is projected to grow from its existing occupancy level of 58.0 percent in 2001
to a stabilized level of 62.0 percent by 2003. It is not expected the existing market will achieve a composite occupancy level in excess of 62.0 percent due to factors of inferior location and obsolescence affecting some of the facilities. Recently completed or pending additions to the lodging supply along the Interstate 80 corridor in Solano County are forecasted to limit Davis hotel occupancy achievement in future years as well.\(^7\)

Occupied room nights are projected to increase from approximately 110,100 in 2001 to approximately 117,700 per year by 2008. At 2.0 percent annual inflation, room rates would increase from $77 to $88. The dominant source of room demand would be the commercial transient and leisure transient sectors, with minimal support from the group segment. Increase in room night demand and rate would yield an increase in room revenue from $8.5 million to $10.4 million annually.

As noted in Table 4.2-1, these projections are conservative when compared to actual results for hotels in Davis. The projected increase of $276,000 annually in room revenue compares to actual average annual increase of $574,000 over the past decade for all transient lodging facilities in Davis. The projected average annual percentage increase of 3.0 percent in revenue growth resulting from the increase in room rate and occupancy is also much lower than the historic 1990-2001 average annual increase of 10.5 percent. With expansion of the campus anticipated for 2014-15 under the next Long Range Development Plan, there would be increases in students, faculty, and staff that would boost hotel demand in the local community because the campus is the major stimulus to the Davis lodging market. Expansion of campus activities could, therefore, result in much more robust performance by Davis hotels than indicated in Table 4.2-1.\(^8\)

**Impacts And Mitigation Measures**

**Standards of Significance**

The relevant standard of significance from the 1994 LRDP EIR is that a land use and planning impact is significant if the project will:

- propose uses which would conflict with locally adopted City or County planning policies.

For purposes of this Focused Tiered EIR, a land use impact is also considered significant if the proposed project would:

- result indirectly in any physical deterioration of the City of Davis caused by the closure and continuing non-use of existing Davis lodging facilities.

Section 15131 of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project, through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project, to physical changes caused in turn by economic or social changes. The intermediate economic or social changes need not be analyzed in any detail greater than necessary to trace the chain of cause and effect. The focus of the analysis, therefore, shall be on potential physical changes that may be indirectly caused by the project.
Project-Specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures

4.2-1 Operation of the proposed project would increase the lodging supply in the City of Davis. This increase would not cause any physical deterioration in the City of Davis due to the closure of existing lodging facilities. There would be no impact.

Development of the proposed project would add 75 rooms to the rooms now available in the nine standard competitive hotels each night (assumed for purposes of the market analysis), for a total of 595 rooms. The annual occupancy potential for the UC Davis hotel would be 27,375 room nights, or 14.4 percent of the existing competitive inventory. It is expected that the proposed project would induce the majority of its own demand because the group segment that would be served by the proposed hotel would be directly related to internally generated demand from the campus. As noted in the Environmental Setting, there is an unmet demand for more than 28,000 room nights for conference and group meeting facilities. The market segment in which the proposed hotel is anticipated to be strong (group demand) is a segment that is not currently significantly served in Davis. Segments in which Davis hotels are strong (commercial and leisure travelers) are segments that would provide much less support to the proposed hotel. Therefore, to a high degree, the market segmentation of the proposed hotel is distinct. The segmentation of hotel demand associated with the proposed hotel, as compared to the Davis lodging market, is shown in Table 4.2-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEGMENTATION OF HOTEL DEMAND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Transient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Methodology

A technical study prepared by Keyser Marston Associates, Inc. (KMA), presented in Appendix E, evaluated the potential economic impact of development of the proposed project on other lodging facilities in the City of Davis. This analysis builds on a previous lodging impact study of a 150-room hotel prepared by PKF (included as Attachment A to Appendix E), which included the following: review of previously developed market and economic feasibility information for the proposed conference center and hotel; evaluation of site access and location relative to demand generators; research and analysis of current economic and demographic trends; identification of existing lodging supply and market performance levels of the properties; review of historical market performance; estimate of anticipated growth in demand for, and supply of, lodging accommodations in the local market with and without the project; and forecast of future lodging demand and occupancy levels on existing lodging and restaurant facilities. After the campus reduced the proposed hotel size from 150 to 75 rooms, PKF provided the campus with a brief memorandum updating the findings of the previous impact analysis and concluding that a
smaller facility would cause little or no negative impact on the occupancy or average room rate of existing lodging facilities within the City of Davis (included as Attachment C to Appendix E).

In addition, the potential for adaptive reuse of the nine standard lodging facilities in Davis was evaluated by Keyser Marston Associates (presented as Attachment B to Appendix E) as part of this DEIR to address the feasibility of converting lodging facilities to student housing, office space, or other uses, in the unlikely event a facility were to close as a result of the proposed project. These reports were used to determine whether the development of the proposed project would result in significant adverse physical effects, based on the standard of significance identified above.

For purposes of the impact analysis, three alternative scenarios were developed to model future conditions, as compared to the no project (baseline) conditions. The model assumed that the Davis lodging market would experience a cumulative amount of growth (30 percent per year versus 10.5 percent actual growth per year for the period 1990-2001) in room revenue between 2001 and 2008, at a rate considerably lower than the historic trend. This growth would be influenced by the growth in student population and development activity at UC Davis, and by induced demand associated with the proposed conference center. Further, the addition of new room availability in the local market would allow greater absorption of rooms during peak demand periods because unsatisfied demand would be able to be accommodated by the larger supply of rooms in the market. In addition, the hotel would serve the group market, which is currently not significantly served by existing lodging facilities in the City which offer few venues for group meetings.

There is an established range of room night demand for university-sponsored conference center hotels, generally at 0.8 to 2.0 room nights per capita of university population. Utilization towards the lower end of this range would generate 20,000+ annual room nights for the proposed project, equating to 73 percent room occupancy per night in the proposed hotel. Utilization toward the upper end of the range would generate about 60,000 room nights per year, accounting for over 200 percent of the annual room nights provided by the proposed hotel.

In establishing fiscal estimates of the potential impact of the project on competitive facilities, the impact analysis assumes 2004 as the base year, corresponding to the likely first year of full operation for the project. The analysis assumes that occupancy during the first year would be 62.0 percent, an occupancy rate that would be comparable to the current rate of the nine standard competitive hotels. The analysis assumes that the occupancy of the proposed hotel would increase to 66.0 percent in 2005, with stabilization at 70 percent occurring in 2006. It is typical for hotel properties to require several years to achieve stabilized occupancy, especially venues specializing in the group market that require time to book conference center meetings, which are scheduled years in advance. The increase in occupancy assumed for the proposed hotel is projected based on historic occupancy and room rate trends that show an increase in room revenue in Davis of 10.5 percent during 1990-2001. The projected occupancy and occupied room nights assumptions for the proposed hotel for the period from 2004 through 2008 are shown in Table 4.2-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4.2-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9
4.2 Land Use and Planning

PROPOSED CONFERENCE CENTER AND HOTEL
PROJECTED OCCUPANCY AND OCCUPIED ROOM NIGHTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Occupancy</th>
<th>Occupied Room Nights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>16,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>18,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>19,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>19,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>19,163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Impact on Competitive Lodging Facilities

Four scenarios were evaluated to assess the range of impact on local hotel operations: no project (i.e., without the proposed hotel and conference center), worst-case, best case, and most likely case. These alternative scenarios about facility operation were modeled to determine the effect of project operation on the competitive inventory from the date of opening (in 2004) through stabilization in 2006 to 2008.

No Project. Table 4.2-1 summarizes projected performance for competitive lodging facilities in Davis without the proposed conference center and hotel. This projection serves as a baseline for the evaluation of potential impacts of the project on local Davis lodging facilities. As discussed in the Environmental Setting, occupied room nights without the project are projected to increase from 110,100 to 117,700 by 2008. Room rates would increase from $77 in 2001 to $88 in 2008. The dominant source of room demand would be the commercial transient and leisure transient sectors, with minimal support from the group segment. Increase in room night demand and rate would yield an increase in room revenue from $8.5 million to $10.4 million annually. An important aspect of the no project scenario is an assumption of relative competitive disadvantage for older facilities. That is, the occupancy percent of the nine competitive facilities is projected never to increase beyond 62.0 percent regardless of overall market growth, due to factors of obsolescence that could restrict future occupancy.

Worst Case. With this scenario, KMA assumed two-thirds of the leisure and commercial business attracted by the project would otherwise have gone to other facilities in Davis and would be a loss for those facilities to the project. In addition, there would be no spillover of group demand to other hotels in Davis resulting from operation of the conference center. Under this scenario, at stabilization (70 percent occupancy for the proposed hotel) there would be 19,200 occupied room nights per year in the project, distributed as follows by market segment: group, 11,500 (60 percent of market); leisure, 2,900 (15 percent of market); and commercial, 4,800 (25 percent of market). If two-thirds of the leisure and commercial business would have been accommodated at other competitive facilities in Davis, the effect on Davis facilities would be the annual loss of 5,200 room nights out of a total of 117,700 occupied room nights in the competitive facilities. As indicated in Table 4.2-4, the loss in room revenue would be approximately $375,000 to $460,000 annually compared to the no project scenario. These amounts are equivalent to about 4 percent of total room revenue. However, even with the reduction in room revenue compared to no project, there would still be good prospects for Table 4.2-4
increase over the 2001 base. As shown in Table 4.2-4, room revenues would increase from approximately $8.5 million to $9.9 million over the 2001-2008 period. In one year only (2004) would there be an absolute decline in room revenue, totaling about $187,000, or less than 2.0 percent of total room revenue in that year. This scenario is deemed worst case for two reasons. First, it is assumed that no conference center business would spill over from the project to other facilities in Davis (although some spillover effect is likely). Second, it is assumed that the bulk of commercial transient and leisure transient business in the project would otherwise have gone to other Davis hotels, even though the pricing of the project at about $130 per room per night is higher than the prevailing average daily rate (ADR) in the competitive facilities, at about $77 per night, and will likely reduce the assumed rate of transfer. It is highly unlikely that the worst case scenario, if it did occur, would be severe enough to imperil the operation of the nine competitive lodging facilities in Davis, assuming sound management and marketing practices by the hotel operators.\textsuperscript{11}

\textit{Best Case.} This scenario is different from the worst case scenario in the following ways. First, it is assumed that one-third (rather than two-thirds) of the leisure and commercial business associated with the proposed project are transfers from other Davis facilities, due to the difference in service and price point between the proposed hotel and other lodging facilities in Davis (discussed above). Second, it is assumed that one-half of the group business demand generated by the conference center operations would be accommodated in local hotels due to the fact that the facility would contain a relatively small inventory of rooms. As described above, conference center room night demand, based on demand for university-sponsored conference center/hotels observed at other campuses, would yield group demand of at least 20,000 room nights annually at UC Davis. The base projection for the proposed hotel at 75 rooms is that there would be 11,500 occupied room nights of demand from the group segment. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that an additional approximately 11,500 room nights from the group segment would be accommodated off-site under this scenario.

As shown in Table 4.2-5, local lodging facilities would lose between $190,000 and $230,000 per year in commercial and leisure business to the proposed hotel and would gain between $830,000 and $1,020,000 annually in group business resulting from spill-over business from the proposed conference center. With this scenario, there would be a net positive effect on local hotel establishments, ranging from $640,000 to $790,000 per year compared to the no project scenario. Total room revenues for the nine competitive hotels is projected to increase from $8.5 million to $11.2 million annually.

A key risk factor for this scenario is that the number of rooms (75) associated with the project would reduce the overall attractiveness of the facility for groups that require larger blocks of rooms because research has shown that groups often have a strong preference for being housed in a single hotel. Therefore, it might be unrealistic to anticipate that effective room night demand with a 75-room facility would be identical to the room night demand associated with the previously proposed 150-room hotel. The inability to accommodate larger meetings could result in loss of patronage.\textsuperscript{12}

\textit{Most Likely Case.} With this scenario, it is assumed that one-half of commercial and leisure business in the proposed hotel are attracted from other Davis facilities. It is also assumed that
Table 4.2-5
only one-half of the spillover demand from the proposed conference center projected for the best case (i.e., 25 percent of group demand) would occur under this scenario due to the limiting factor of hotel size noted above. The most likely case scenario, therefore, recognizes that although the proposed project’s conference facilities are largely unchanged from the previously proposed 150-room hotel/conference center facility, overall demand from the group market segment could be reduced due to the inability to house larger groups in the proposed hotel, with subsequent reduction of positive spill-over to local hotels.

As shown in Table 4.2-6, room revenues under the most likely case scenario would increase from approximately $8.5 million to $10.6 million over the 2001-2008 period. With this scenario, there would be an overall increase in room revenue to local hotels of about $130,000 to $160,000 annually compared to no project.

The key factor that would limit negative impacts on local hotel operations and create possibilities for positive effects is that the rooms provided by the proposed project hotel would primarily serve a market niche (group meetings) that is not now significantly served by facilities in the City of Davis. The reasons why there is strong likelihood that the proposed hotel will successfully attract group business are the following:

- UC Davis is a highly ranked university nationally and is particularly strong in specific graduate programs focused on the life sciences. Scientists and other professionals are drawn to the campus from national and international locations.
- Existing meeting facilities on-campus experience high demand, with little or no excess capacity.
- The location of the project is excellent because it is adjacent to the new Center for the Performing Arts, the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center, and Mrak Hall (administrative center of the campus), with freeway identity and accessibility. The identity as a university facility can be fully delineated, thereby differentiating this project from other lodging facilities in Davis.
- The proposed conference center operator, Benchmark Hospitality, is a seasoned operator that has succeeded at other similar venues.
- Existing hotels in Davis and vicinity do not provide venues for meetings. Existing Davis hotels have minimal meeting space and are oriented primarily to meeting the needs of commercial and leisure travelers.
- As discussed previously, there is an established range of room night demand for university-sponsored conference center hotels. Utilization would generate about 20,000 to 60,000 room nights per year. At the lower end of this range, 20,000 room nights would account for 73 percent of the rooms in the proposed hotel facility; 60,000 room nights would account for over 200 percent of the annual room nights provided by the proposed hotel.
Table 4.2-6
There is a history/track record of university conference centers supporting strong group business, with differentiation from other lodging facilities in their market areas, as documented by PKF Consulting (Attachment A to Appendix E). The mix of group and transient business projected for the proposed hotel is not unlike the mix at other university-related conference centers, with group business accounting for 60 percent of total business, commercial transient visitors accounting for 25 percent, and transient leisure visitors accounting for 15 percent.

In addition, the project's business plan would incorporate measures that would reduce negative impacts on local hotel operations and encourage positive effects. First, UC Davis would continue to use local motels to accommodate visiting sports teams. In addition, the campus is eliminating the complete meeting package, thereby affording conference attendees more options to use local hotels and restaurants. Furthermore, the campus would dedicate 3 percent of gross room receipts from the hotel, paid in lieu of transient occupancy tax, for long-term membership in the Davis Conference and Visitors Bureau and to support joint marketing efforts such as tram service to downtown Davis.14

Adaptive Reuse of Lodging Properties

As indicated above, the proposed project would not significantly affect the fiscal earnings of Davis lodging facilities. The Keyser Marston Associates study (UC Davis Hotel and Conference Center/Impact on Lodging Facilities in the City of Davis, included as Attachment B to Appendix E of this DEIR) identified that a few of the lodging facilities, due to factors of location and physical condition, are performing poorly, despite good market conditions in Davis. The future viability of those facilities could change, whether or not the proposed conference center and hotel is built.15 However, the adaptive reuse of any of the nine standard lodging facilities in Davis was also evaluated as part of this DEIR to address the feasibility of converting lodging facilities to student housing, office space, or other uses in the highly unlikely event that any of these facilities were to go out of business as a result of the proposed project.

Due to increasing student enrollment at UC Davis and the shortage of student housing available both on and off campus, there is a significant need for housing students in the full range of academic standing, from freshmen to graduate students. The campus has targeted on-campus development opportunities for new residence hall construction with the goal of having the capacity to house all incoming freshmen. For the large majority of continuing and graduate students, off-campus housing is required, primarily in private apartment complexes. Due to their reliance on UC Davis students, these apartments require full-year leases from September to August. With current vacancy rates less than 1 percent, it is difficult to secure an apartment during the academic year after the beginning of the lease cycle. Reuse of lodging facilities for student housing would be feasible due to the favorable economics and the physical characteristics of Davis lodging facilities. In general, the nine standard hotels appear to be in adequate to excellent physical condition, and they would require relatively minor expense for conversion to student housing use. Many of the hotel rooms are in a size range that could accommodate two students similar to an on-campus residence hall. Other rooms are in a suite arrangement that could accommodate three or four students. Some of the hotels have small meeting rooms, or lounges with kitchen facilities, which could be adapted for use as study rooms.
or community recreation rooms for students. In addition, based on a test case\textsuperscript{1} in Davis for adaptive reuse, adaptive reuse of transient lodging facilities for student housing appears economically feasible. Specifically, the campus could enter into a master lease agreement with the hotel owner and recapture all of its costs through reimbursements from students, and students could occupy the facility at costs competitive with those for other student housing in Davis (on- and off-campus).

In addition, local real estate professionals indicate the office market in downtown Davis is strong, and smaller and larger firms have difficulty locating space. Strong tenant rent rates would provide latitude for owners or master lessees to adapt older space and lease it to office tenants. Therefore, the potential for adaptive reuse of lodging facilities as office space also exists in the City of Davis.\textsuperscript{16}

Conclusion

In summary, the additional hotel rooms that would be placed on the market by the project could have a range of effects on Davis lodging facilities, as follows:

- The worst case would have a small negative economic impact on local lodging facilities.
- The best case would have a moderately positive impact on local lodging facilities.
- The most likely case would have a minor positive impact on local lodging facilities.

As noted above, the City of Davis has been an expanding market for lodging, with large increases in room revenue occurring over the previous decade. Table 4.2-7 shows projected room revenue for the competitive inventory of local hotels for each of the three scenarios discussed above. As indicated, with the no project scenario, room revenue for the competitive hotels is projected to increase from $8.5 million to $10.4 million annually through 2008. With the worst case scenario, room revenue for the competitive hotels is projected to increase from $8.5 million to $9.9 million by 2008. With the best case scenario, room revenue for the competitive hotels is projected to increase from $8.5 million to $11.2 million by 2008 and with the most likely case, room revenue for the competitive hotels is projected to increase from $8.5 million to $10.6 million by 2008. As noted, only with the worst case is there a decline from the no project condition.\textsuperscript{17}

The project would have minimal impact on the hotel facilities in the City of Davis because the market for those facilities is sharply differentiated from the market that would be served by the proposed hotel, i.e., local hotels serve primarily commercial and leisure visitors, and the proposed hotel would primarily serve groups attracted by the proposed conference center. As previously discussed, this conclusion is further supported by the following factors identified by UC Davis:

\textsuperscript{1} The specific lodging facility in downtown Davis used as a test case example was selected primarily because of its physical configuration, which includes one separate two-story wing that lends itself to the student housing concept. The wing could be easily adapted for double-occupancy student housing use while the remaining 101 rooms could continue as motel use. This wing also includes common meeting rooms that could be used as student lounges/kitchens. The analysis could be extended to other Davis lodging facilities as well because the analysis is based on industry averages, and many characteristics of the test case facility are not unique to that facility.
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Table 4.2-7
Current arrangements for campus business with local lodging facilities that accommodate visiting sports teams will be maintained.

The campus is eliminating the complete meeting package, thereby affording conference attendees more options to use local hotels and restaurants.

The campus will dedicate 3 percent of gross room receipts from the proposed hotel, paid in lieu of transient occupancy tax, for long-term membership in the Davis Conference and Visitors Bureau (DCVB) and to support joint marketing efforts such as tram service to downtown Davis.

The financial modeling indicates that even with the worst case scenario, in which two-thirds of the leisure and commercial business in the proposed hotel is assumed to be a transfer from local lodging establishments, upward growth in room revenues would still occur, except for one year, in which a cumulative loss for all facilities totaling less than $200,000 could occur. This amount is equal to about 2 percent of room revenues for that year and represents a change in revenue that is less than frequently occurs with normal fluctuations in the lodging market. The average annual revenue increase for all Davis lodging facilities in the last decade (of which the competitive inventory comprises 80 to 85 percent) has been nearly $550,000. Therefore, the potential loss is a small portion of the increase in revenue.\(^{18}\)

As noted in the Environmental Setting, a few of the lodging facilities in Davis are performing poorly due to factors of location and obsolescence. The future viability of those facilities may be questionable, whether or not the proposed hotel is constructed. Even in the unlikely event that one or more of the motels was forced to close due to the one-year decline in revenue assumed for the worst-case scenario, those properties would not remain vacant. Existing lodging facilities could be adaptively and profitably reused for student housing or office space.\(^{19}\)

Based on the foregoing analysis, the proposed project would not indirectly cause any physical deterioration in the downtown area of Davis as a result of hotel closures and inability to re-use the properties. Therefore, there would be \textit{no impact}.

\section*{Mitigation Measures}

\subsection*{4.2-1 None required.}

\subsection*{4.2-2 Operation of the proposed project would not conflict with the City of Davis General Plan land use policies and related economic and business development policies. There would be \textit{no impact}.}

Policies ED 1.1, ED 2.1, and ED 3.2 in the Economic and Business Development Element of the 2001 City of Davis General Plan encourage the promotion of Davis as a destination for visitors with interests in university/academic events and conferences and to provide for an increase in new businesses and amenities that bring people to the downtown area. The City’s Economic Development Strategic Plan and the Core Area Strategy Report also identify the need to attract targeted visitors, along with a goal of increasing transient occupancy tax and retail sales. There are, however, no policies or implementing actions in these plans that provide specific direction regarding the development of a conference center/hotel facility within the City limits, and Goal
ED 1 provides that retail and business development need not be limited exclusively to the core area.

As discussed in greater detail in Impact 4.2-1, above, the proposed project would increase the supply of rooms in the Davis market and would generate the majority of its room sales from markets not currently lodging in Davis by focusing on educational, corporate, and association meetings. It is expected that the proposed project would capture a significant portion of the current turn-away demand generated by UC Davis (i.e., UC Davis event attendees that use Sacramento or other out-of-area lodging facilities because Davis lodging facilities do not have vacancies). In addition, the project would accommodate conferences with up to 500 attendees, but it would only be able to accommodate 75 overnight guests. Conference attendees who are not accommodated at the adjacent hotel would provide demand for existing lodging facilities in downtown Davis.

While conference center/hotel/dining complexes such as the proposed project generally accommodate dining of a substantial number of guests and visitors, these facilities also lose a portion of their business to other locations. For example, typically, about 24 to 31 percent of conference center attendees dine off-site. Because much of the demand for the proposed conference center and hotel is anticipated to be self-induced, the project is expected to encourage new demand for local dining facilities.

Such positive spillover effects would benefit the City of Davis by increasing sales revenues and tax generation. The project would be consistent with the City’s General Plan goals and policies to attract people and new businesses to the Davis downtown area.

Further, as indicated in a letter from the campus to the Davis City Council and Yolo County Board of Supervisors, the in-lieu tax generated by the proposed project (3 percent) would be used to increase occupancy in local hotels and to encourage patronage of downtown Davis businesses. More specifically, one percent of the funds would be used to pay the campus’ long-term membership in the Davis Conference and Visitors Bureau (DCVB), and two percent of the in-lieu tax would support joint marketing efforts (including tram service to downtown Davis). Membership in the DCVB and facilitation of tram service would encourage conference planning that coordinates lodging, dining, and shopping at downtown facilities. After the proposed hotel is constructed, the campus would maintain its existing agreement with downtown Davis hotels to use their facilities to provide accommodations for visiting sports teams.

Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with locally adopted City planning policies, and there would be no impact.

Mitigation Measures

4.2-2 None required.
Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The cumulative context for the evaluation of land use conflicts is buildout under the 1994 LRDP, including the proposed project, combined with growth anticipated in the City of Davis General Plan, and the Yolo and Solano County General Plans.

Cumulative impacts of campus growth through 2005-06 on land use and planning issues are addressed in Section 4.1 of the 1994 LRDP EIR. The 1994 LRDP EIR cumulative land use and planning analysis was updated to reflect land use designation changes in the WWTP Replacement Project EIR (Chapter 4.6 of the DEIR), the 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR (Chapter 8 of the DSEIR), the Center for the Arts Performance Hall and South Entry Roadway and Parking Improvements Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (page 29 in the Tiered Initial Study), the USDA Western Human Nutrition Research Complex Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (pages 45-46 in the Tiered Initial Study), and the Segundo Housing Improvement Projects Tiered Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (pages 33 to 35 in the Tiered Initial Study). Amendments to the 1994 LRDP and updates and revisions to the 1994 LRDP EIR are discussed further in Appendix C of this DEIR. No cumulative land use impacts related to 1994 LRDP or City of Davis General Plan consistency were identified.

As discussed in the Environmental Setting, there are no new lodging developments currently under construction or proposed in the Davis market area other than the proposed project. There are several properties under construction or proposed along the I-80 corridor in Solano County (Cordelia, Fairfield, Vacaville, Dixon areas). The properties are projected to effectively place a ceiling on occupancy potential for the Davis market in future years.22 However, it is unlikely that the project would contribute to any adverse effect on occupancy rates (as discussed above).

Therefore, there would be no cumulative land use and planning impacts.

Potential Cumulative Land Use and Planning Effects through 2014-15

The campus has prepared a Cumulative Impacts Analysis, presented as Appendix D of this document, that serves to inform the public concerning all that is currently known about the campus’ potential growth through 2014-15. This analysis includes an evaluation of the possible cumulative land use and planning effects of anticipated development through 2014-15.

As discussed further in Appendix D, anticipated growth through 2014-15 is not expected to introduce any new cumulative land use and planning impacts or require any new mitigation measures. The campus expects to adopt a new LRDP before projections assumed in the 1994 LRDP are exceeded. The new LRDP will propose general types of physical development and designate land use categories to support campus growth projected through 2014-15. The new LRDP will be the applicable land use plan for the campus. Although the campus is not required to consider its consistency with land use plans or policies for other jurisdictions, the campus assumes it will continue to comply with the General Plans for the City of Davis and the Counties of Yolo and Solano through 2014-15. The campus will reexamine potential land use and planning impacts and any new mitigation measures that may be required during the LRDP update process.
ENDNOTES


14. Larry N. Vanderhoef, Chancellor, letter to Yolo County Board of Supervisors and Davis City Council, August 15, 2001.


21. Larry N. Vanderhoef, Chancellor, letter to Yolo County Board of Supervisors and Davis City Council, August 15, 2001.

4.3 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Introduction

This section addresses the potential effects of the project on intersection level of service (LOS) on and adjacent to the campus and on parking. All other transportation-related impacts are fully addressed in the Tiered Initial Study for this project and are not addressed in this section (see Appendix A). All relevant information, including applicable environmental and regulatory setting, standards of significance, and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.3 of the 1994 LRDP EIR as supplemented by Chapter 8 of the 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR, and Section 3 of the Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities Focused Tiered EIR, are incorporated by reference and summarized below, as appropriate. See Amendments to the 1994 LRDP and Revisions to the 1994 LRDP EIR (through November 2001) included in Appendix C of this DEIR for more information.

This section summarizes an analysis of “existing-plus-project” conditions conducted specifically for the project. This analysis includes the utilization of new traffic volume data collected in March 2001, the estimation of the traffic characteristics associated with the project for both “event” and “non-event” conditions, calculation of existing-plus-project traffic volumes, analysis of roadway operating conditions, comparison to standards of significance, and development of mitigation measures (as appropriate). “Event” conditions include major events at the proposed conference center alone, or combined with events at the Center for the Performing Arts. “Non-event” conditions refer to the typical daily operation of the proposed project.

The data, methodology, and conclusions regarding project-specific and cumulative transportation and circulation effects of the proposed project presented in this section are detailed in Appendix F, Transportation and Circulation Analysis UC Davis Conference Center, Hotel and Graduate School of Management Building.

Environmental Setting

Section 4.3 of the 1994 LRDP DEIR, as supplemented, contains a detailed description of the transportation systems on campus and in the adjacent areas of the City of Davis, Yolo County, and Solano County. This section contains new information updating and refining the information presented in the 1994 LRDP EIR, as well as more detailed information concerning the proposed facilities.

Motorized Roadway System

Regional roadway access to the campus and the City of Davis is provided primarily by I-80 and SR 113. Access to the campus from the City of Davis is primarily from A Street, B Street, First
Street, and Russell Boulevard. On campus, the major element of the central campus roadway system is the Loop Road System that encircles the concentrated area of academic and administrative uses. Inside the loop, general motor vehicle access is either prohibited or limited to specific destinations, with public through traffic eliminated. The Loop Road System consists of Russell Boulevard, A Street, Old Davis Road, California Avenue and La Rue Road. Access to and from the proposed project site would be from Realigned Old Davis Road (currently under construction) (see Figure 3-2 in the Chapter 3, Project Description).

Parking, bicycle paths, and transit service are provided throughout the campus, including in the vicinity of the project site. Parking and bicycle paths are concentrated on the core of the central campus.

See Figure 3-8 on page 3-18 of the 1994 LRDP DEIR for an illustration of major parking areas and roadways.

Existing Roadway Operating Conditions

Certain intersections were evaluated based on the anticipated volume of project traffic, the distributional patterns of project traffic, and known locations of operational difficulty. Evaluated intersections also include the major intersections that were evaluated in the 1994 LRDP EIR. Based on this, the following 31 existing and one future intersections were evaluated:

- County Road 98 and Russell Boulevard
- SR 113 Southbound Ramp and Russell Boulevard
- SR 113 Northbound Ramp and Russell Boulevard
- County Road 98 and Hutchison Drive
- Hopkins Road and Hutchison Drive
- SR 113 Southbound Ramp and Hutchison Drive
- SR 113 Northbound Ramp and Hutchison Drive
- Hutchison Drive and Health Sciences Drive
- La Rue Road and Hutchison Drive
- La Rue Road and Russell Boulevard
- La Rue Road and Orchard Park Drive
- La Rue Road and Garrod Drive
- California Avenue and Russell Boulevard
- California Avenue and Old Davis Road
- California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road
- Old Davis Road and I-80 Westbound Ramp
- Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramp
- Mrak Hall Drive and Realigned Old Davis Road (future, under construction)
- Oak Avenue and Russell Boulevard
- Howard Way and Russell Boulevard
- A Street and Russell Boulevard
- B Street and Russell Boulevard
- B Street and Third Street
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- A Street and First Street
- A Street and Old Davis Road
- Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road
- B Street and First Street
- D Street and First Street
- Richards Boulevard/E Street and First Street
- Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive
- I-80 Eastbound Ramps and Richards Boulevard
- Research Park Drive and Richards Boulevard

Existing Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes Operating Conditions

As part of the campus Mitigation Monitoring Program, traffic volume data were collected for the selected intersections during the a.m. and p.m. peak commuter hours during the week of March 5, 2001.

Field reconnaissance was undertaken to ascertain the traffic control characteristics of each of the study area intersections. Determination of roadway operating conditions is based upon comparison of known or projected traffic volumes during peak hours to roadway capacity. In an urban setting, roadway capacity is generally governed by intersection characteristics. LOS describes roadway operating conditions. LOS is a qualitative measure of the effect of a number of factors, including speed and travel time, traffic interruptions, freedom to maneuver, safety, driving comfort and convenience, and operating costs. LOS are designated “A” through “F,” from best to worst, covering the entire range of traffic operations that might occur. LOS “A” through “E” generally represent traffic volumes at less than roadway capacity, while LOS “F” represents over capacity and/or forced flow conditions. Table 4.3-1 presents general LOS definitions.

Intersection capacity analysis (both signalized and unsignalized) in this study was conducted utilizing methodology from the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). The 2000 HCM was selected because it is the latest available nationally recognized methodology, and includes the results of research that provide improved analytical techniques compared to earlier editions of the HCM. The 2000 HCM methods are updated from the methodology utilized in the 1994 LRDP EIR (the then current 1985 HCM method); therefore, direct comparisons of the results of this study to the 1994 analysis may result in seemingly contradictory results.

The signalized intersection analysis methodology is known as “operational analysis.” This procedure calculates an average control delay per vehicle at a signalized intersection, and assigns a level of service designation based upon the delay. Control delay includes initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration delay. The method also provides a calculation of the volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio of the critical movements at the intersection. Table 4.3-2 presents the LOS criteria for signalized intersections.

Table 4.3-3 presents the LOS criteria for unsignalized intersections. For all-way stop-controlled intersections, the LOS is based upon the average intersection control delay. For two-way stop-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>Represents free flow. Individual users are virtually unaffected by the presence of others in the traffic stream. Freedom to select desired speeds and to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely high. The general level of comfort and convenience provided to the motorist, passenger, or pedestrian is excellent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>Is in the range of stable flow, but the presence of other users in the traffic stream begins to be noticeable. Freedom to select desired speeds is relatively unaffected, but there is a slight decline in the freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream from LOS A. The level of comfort and convenience provided is somewhat less than at LOS A, because the presence of others in the traffic stream begins to affect individual behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Is in the range of stable flow, but marks the beginning of the range of flow in which the operations of individual users becomes significantly affected by interactions with others in the traffic stream. The selection of speed is now affected by the presence of others, and maneuvering within the traffic stream requires substantial vigilance on the part of the user. The general level of comfort and convenience declines noticeably at this level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Represents high-density, but stable, flow. Speed and freedom to maneuver are severely restricted, and the driver or pedestrian experiences a generally poor level of comfort and convenience. Small increases in traffic flow will generally cause operational problems at this level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Represents operating conditions at or near the capacity level. All speeds are reduced to a low, but relatively uniform value. Freedom to maneuver within the traffic stream is extremely difficult, and it is generally accomplished by forcing a vehicle or pedestrian to “give way” to accommodate such maneuvers. Comfort and convenience levels are extremely poor, and driver or pedestrian frustration is generally high. Operations at this level are usually unstable, because small increases in flow or minor perturbations within the traffic stream will cause breakdowns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>Is used to define forced or breakdown flow. This condition exists wherever the amount of traffic approaching a point exceeds the amount that can traverse the point. Queues form behind such locations. Operations within the queue are characterized by stop-and-go waves, and they are extremely unstable. Vehicles may progress at reasonable speeds for several hundred feet or more, then be required to stop in a cyclic fashion. Level of service “F” is used to describe the operating conditions within the queue, as well as the point of the breakdown.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4.3-2
LEVEL OF SERVICE CRITERIA
SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level Of Service (Los)</th>
<th>Control Delay Per Vehicle (Seconds)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>≤ 10.0</td>
<td>Very low control delay. Occurs when progression is extremely favorable and most vehicles arrive during the green phase. Most vehicles do not stop at all. Short cycle lengths may also contribute to low delay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&gt; 10.0 and ≤ 20.0</td>
<td>Generally occurs with good progression, short cycle lengths, or both. More vehicles stop than with LOS “A,” causing higher levels of average delay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt; 20.0 and ≤ 35.0</td>
<td>These higher delays may result from fair progression, longer cycle lengths, or both. Individual cycle failures may begin to appear at this level. The number of vehicles stopping is significant at this level, though many still pass through the intersection without stopping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&gt; 35.0 and ≤ 55.0</td>
<td>The influence of congestion becomes more noticeable. Longer delays may result from some combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high v/c ratios. Many vehicles stop, and the proportion of vehicles not stopping declines. Individual cycle failures are noticeable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt; 55.0 and ≤ 80.0</td>
<td>These high delay values generally indicate poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high v/c ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt; 80.0</td>
<td>This level, considered to be unacceptable to most drivers, often occurs with oversaturation, that is, when arrival flow rates exceed the capacity of the intersection. It may also occur at high v/c ratios below 1.0 with many individual cycle failures. Poor progression and long cycle lengths may also be major contributing causes to such delay levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


controlled intersections, LOS is computed for each controlled movement/lane group based upon the average control delay for the movement. For consistency with earlier environmental analyses associated with the 1994 LRDP, an intersection average LOS has also been calculated based upon overall intersection delay. The intersection average LOS is utilized in the determination of impacts.

Table 4.3-4 presents the results of the intersection capacity analyses at the study area intersections.
### TABLE 4.3-4

**EXISTING PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION OPERATING CONDITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersecting Roadways</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (seconds)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Delay (seconds)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins Road</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci. Drive</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Dr.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Avenue</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Way</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Drive</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Street</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 EB Ramps</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Park Dr.</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Level of Service. **Bold** indicates conditions exceeding the standards of significance.
2. Future Intersection; under construction
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Field observations during peak commuter hours have indicated extensive queuing and delay in the vicinity of the Richards Boulevard underpass. The traffic volumes collected at the Richards Boulevard intersections with First/E Streets and with Olive Drive are constrained by the available capacity at the underpass; therefore, the delay and LOS at these locations are based upon field observations rather than the results of the 2000 HCM calculations.

The City of Davis has recently installed a northbound right turn lane on Richards Boulevard at its intersection with First / E Streets. This improvement provides additional capacity in the corridor, but does not eliminate the extensive queuing and LOS F conditions.

**Roadway Improvements Under Construction**

The campus is currently constructing the Center for the Arts Performance Hall and South Entry Roadway and Parking Improvements project in the vicinity of the proposed project that includes the following elements:

- construction of the South Entry Parking Structure (completed and occupied);
- construction of new surface parking lots (completed and occupied);
- construction of the Center for the Arts Performance Hall (under construction);
- realignment of Old Davis Road (Realigned Old Davis Road) from the kiosk to east of Mrak Hall Drive (under construction);
- conversion of Old Davis Road from California Avenue to Mrak Hall Drive from general use to bicycle/pedestrian/service vehicle use (to be implemented when Realigned Old Davis Road is completed);
- installation of a traffic signal at the new intersection of Realigned Old Davis Road and Mrak Hall Drive (to be implemented when Realigned Old Davis Road is completed); and
- removal of the existing traffic signal at the intersection of Old Davis Road and Mrak Hall Drive, and replacement with an all-way stop (to be implemented when Realigned Old Davis Road is completed). The west leg of this intersection will be limited to bicycle/pedestrian/service vehicle use.

The completion of this project will result in a traffic shift from Old Davis Road to Realigned Old Davis Road. The effects of these changes were estimated, and the results of the capacity analyses at the adjacent intersections are summarized in Table 4.3-5. All of the adjacent intersections are anticipated to operate at an acceptable LOS.

**Parking**

Existing parking facilities in the project vicinity include 860 visitor and permit surface parking spaces in Parking Lots 1 and 2 (approximately 713 spaces in Lot 1 and 147 spaces in Lot 2), and
approximately 716 permit spaces in the South Entry Parking Structure. The South Entry Parking Structure also provides visitor parking on weekends and after 5 p.m. on weekdays.

| TABLE 4.3-5 |
| BASELINE PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION OPERATING CONDITIONS¹ |
| Intersecting Roadways | A.M. Peak Hour | P.M. Peak Hour |
| | Delay (seconds) | LOS | Delay (seconds) | LOS |
| California Ave. | Old Davis Road | 10.5 | B | 10.5 | B |
| California Ave. | Realigned Old Davis Road | 15.9 | C | 7.1 | A |
| Mrak Hall Drive | Realigned Old Davis Road | 13.8 | B | 14.8 | B |
| Mrak Hall Drive | Old Davis Road | 11.1 | B | 10.8 | B |

¹. Upon completion of the Center for the Arts Performance Hall and South Entry Roadway and Parking Improvements.
². Level of Service.

Impacts And Mitigation Measures

Standards of Significance

The environmental analysis in the 1994 LRDP EIR developed the following standards of significance that apply to the proposed project. A transportation/circulation impact is considered significant if campus or regional growth would exceed the following standards:

- LOS for roadways within the City of Davis and the central campus of LOS “D” for existing roadways and LOS “C” for new roadways;
- LOS for County roadways of LOS “C”;
- LOS for I-80 of LOS “E”;
- LOS for SR 113 of LOS “D”;
- result in an increase in winter parking utilization over 90 percent on the central campus, Medical Sciences Complex, and/or major facilities of the west and south campuses;
- result in the elimination of existing parking and increases in the projected utilization rate over 85 percent without permitting adequate time (usually 24 months) to implement a parking solution (to campus construction standards); or
- require additional parking and result in an increase in the utilization rate over 90 percent, unless decreases in projected campus parking demand are expected to substantially counteract this trend.
The 1994 LRDP EIR did not include standards of significance to address traffic generated by events held at major campus venues such as the Recreation Hall, Toomey Field, and Freeborn Hall. The following standards of significance would apply to the proposed project.

A transportation/circulation impact is considered significant if an event at a major campus venue would exceed the following standards:

- LOS “F” on campus roads for more than one hour before or after an event with mandatory manual traffic control;
- LOS “E” for roadways in the City of Davis outside the downtown core, or LOS “F” in the downtown core, for more than one hour before or after an event;
- LOS “E” for County roadways;
- LOS “E” for I-80; or
- LOS “E” for SR 113.

The LOS standards are based, in part, on the standards of the City of Davis that were current in 1994. In the General Plan adopted in May 2001, the City has included the following new LOS standards:

- unless preempted by the County Congestion Management Plan, LOS “E” for automobiles is sufficient for arterials and collectors during peak traffic hours.
- LOS “F” is acceptable in the Core Area (generally downtown area of the City).

Although the new City standards are less stringent than the 1994 LRDP standards, the 1994 LRDP standards are utilized in this analysis in order to provide a more conservative analysis.

**Project-Specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

4.3-1 Increases in traffic volumes associated with the proposed project in relationship to the capacity of the future transportation network would contribute to LOS exceedances. This is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

A total of 375 new employees would be added to the campus population associated with the proposed project including approximately 100 new employees associated with the proposed conference center facility and hotel, and a total of 275 employees associated with accommodating the Graduate School of Management, the Office of University Relations, and Internship and Career Center programs. The 275 employees would not all be new to the campus, and would include employees who are relocating to this area of the campus. The space currently utilized by these 275 employees is assumed to be backfilled by other new employees.
The currently proposed conference center would accommodate functions with up to approximately 500 attendees. The facility would include an approximately 75 person capacity restaurant and an approximately 75 person capacity pub.

To evaluate the potential transportation impacts of the project, two conditions have been evaluated:

Non-Event Conditions - reflects typical weekday a.m. and p.m. peak commuter hour conditions without a major conference center event, without a major daytime event at the Center for the Arts Performance Hall, and with full occupancy of the hotel facility.

The analysis of non-event conditions is based upon typical weekday conditions during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Circulation and parking system modifications recently completed and/or currently under construction are included in the analysis (see discussion in Setting under Roadway Improvements Under Construction).

Under such non-event conditions, it is anticipated that activities at the conference center would be primarily associated with other campus activities, such as academic conferences and meetings that primarily involve attendance by participants already on campus. Non-event conditions would also include meetings that are oriented to off-campus participants and would be anticipated to be much smaller than the facility capacity.

Event Conditions – evaluates two potential event conditions: (1) an event at the conference center during peak commuter hours without a concurrent event at the Center for the Performing Arts; and (2) an event at the conference center during peak commuter hours with a concurrent event at the Center for the Performing Arts. The following describes the parameters of both event conditions evaluated in this analysis.

Event Condition 1 - reflects operations during the a.m. and p.m. peak commuter hours with a major conference center event.

The analysis of event condition 1 provides disclosure of roadway operating conditions that could result from an intensive, specialized use of the conference center (with no concurrent event at the adjacent Center for the Performing Arts). Such intense events are anticipated to occur a few times per year. This analysis provides a conservative review of potential conditions associated with the project.

The planning parameters for event condition 1 are as follows:

- classes are in session;
- full occupancy of the hotel facility; and
- full occupancy of the conference center (500 persons), with the following conference characteristics:
4.3 Transportation and Circulation

- single-day conference, with a full day schedule (approximately 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., coinciding with campus employment schedules);

- no conference attendees staying at the hotel;

- a non-campus conference, such that the attendees would not have already been on campus; and

- conference attendees are from the Greater Sacramento and Bay Area regions, and generally arrive by automobile.

Typical events at the conference center are expected to be campus-oriented. As such, the typical number of new trips would be less than those associated with event condition 1, since campus participants would already be on campus. Also, event condition 1 assumes that event beginning and ending times coincide with the peak commuter periods. Different beginning and ending times would result in fewer new trips generated during the critical commuter a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Therefore, the event condition 1 analysis overestimates the traffic impacts that would be created by a more typical academic conference.

**Event Condition 2** - reflects operations during the a.m. and p.m. peak commuter hours with a major conference center event concurrent with a major weekday event at the Center for the Performing Arts.

The analysis of event condition 2 provides disclosure of roadway operating conditions that could result from concurrent intensive, specialized use of the conference center in combination with the Center for the Performing Arts. Such concurrent intense events are anticipated to occur rarely, if at all. Therefore, this analysis considers an extreme condition with traffic volumes that would rarely, if ever, occur.

The planning parameters for event condition 2 are as follows:

- all parameters associated with event condition 1;

- full occupancy of the Center for the Performing Arts auditorium (1,800 persons), with the following characteristics:
  - full day schedule (approximately 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., coinciding with campus employment schedules);
  - a non-campus event, such that the attendees would not have already been on campus; and
  - Center for the Performing Arts attendees are from the Greater Sacramento and Bay Area regions, and generally arrive by automobile and bus.

Typical daytime events at the conference center are expected to be campus-oriented. As such, the actual number of new trips would be less than those analyzed under event condition 2, since
campus participants would already be on campus. The most likely non-campus midday event that could fully utilize the 1,800-seat auditorium would involve a program for school children who would most likely travel by bus, van, or car pool. Also, event condition 2 assumes that event beginning and ending times coincide with the peak commuter periods. Different beginning and ending times would result in fewer new trips generated during the critical commuter a.m. and p.m. peak hours. School children are more likely to come after the morning peak hour and leave before the afternoon peak hour. Therefore, the event condition 2 analysis greatly overestimates the traffic impacts that would be created by more typical event conditions.

Trip Generation

Trip generation of the proposed project, for both non-event and event conditions, is based on a number of sources, including the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ *Trip Generation, Sixth Edition*, and trip generation and mode choice information collected at the campus. Table 4.3-6 presents the motorized vehicle trip generation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Non-Event Conditions</th>
<th>Event Condition 1</th>
<th>Event Condition 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entering the Campus</td>
<td>Exiting the Campus</td>
<td>Entering the Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M. Peak Hour</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M. Peak Hour</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of Average Weekday</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekday</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>1,496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Time period of peak hour varies by location on campus. For analysis purposes, the peak volume at each location has been considered.
2. Based upon Tuesday through Thursday conditions.

Source: DKS Associates, 2001, based on Institute of Transportation Engineers’ *Trip Generation, Sixth Edition*, and traffic volume and mode choice information collected on the campus during the 1994 LRDP process, and documents in Section 4.3 of the 1994 LRDP EIR.

Non-Event Conditions

The 375 new employees associated with the proposed project (75 associated with the Graduate School of Management, 275 associated with the Office of University Relations and the Internship and Career Center, and 100 associated with the conference center and hotels facilities) are estimated to generate approximately 1,742 daily motorized vehicle trips. During the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, 129 and 151 trips are anticipated, respectively. The estimation of trips associated with the Graduate School of Management, Office of University Relations, and Internship and Career Center employees accommodated by the project is based upon traffic volume and mode choice information collected on the campus during the 1994 LRDP process, and documented in Section 4.3 of the 1994 LRDP EIR. The estimation of trips associated with non-event employees and attendees at the conference center and hotel facilities are based on data from the Institute of Transportation Engineers’ (ITE) *Trip Generation, Sixth Edition*, and
assumes full hotel room occupancy. These trips include all trips associated with general hotel and conference center activity, including employee and service vehicle trips. The ITE data also assumes typical utilization of conference and meeting rooms, restaurants, and other typical hotel amenities.

**Event Condition 1**

Additional trips associated with full occupancy of the conference center (event condition 1) were estimated and added to the trip generation of the non-event condition. Event Condition 1 is anticipated to generate about 344 additional vehicular trips during each of the a.m. and p.m. peak hours for a total of 473 trips on the a.m. peak hour and 495 trips in the p.m. peak hour. This number of trips is based upon all 500 attendees arriving by automobile, 1.2 persons per vehicle, and 75 percent peak direction arrival/departure in the peak commuter hours. During the remainder of the day, about 562 additional trips (for a total of 2,022 trips) are anticipated, resulting in a total of approximately 2,992 daily motorized vehicle trips under event condition 1 (approximately 1,250 more daily trips than under Non-event conditions).

**Event Condition 2**

Additional trips associated with full occupancy of the 1,800-seat auditorium were estimated and added to the trip generation of the non-event condition and event condition 1. The following parameters were utilized:

- ninety percent peak direction arrival/departure in the peak commuter hours;
- one-third arrival by private automobile/small vans, with an average occupancy of 2.5 persons per vehicle; and
- two-thirds arrival by bus, with an average occupancy of 30 persons per vehicle.

This event condition is expected to generate about 277 additional vehicle trips during each of the a.m. and p.m. peak hours for a total of approximately 750 and 772 trips in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively. During the remainder of the day, about 246 additional trips are anticipated (for a total of 2,268 trips), resulting in a total of approximately 3,792 motorized vehicle trips under event condition 2 (approximately 800 more daily trips than under event condition 1 and approximately 2,050 more daily trips compared to non-event conditions).

**Trip Distribution**

The distribution of trips to the project is based upon the following factors:

- anticipated origins and destinations of project traffic;
- observed travel patterns and traffic volumes in the vicinity of the project; and
- travel times on the roadway system.
Because the event conditions are based on attendance by non-campus and local oriented visitors, different distributions were developed for non-event and event (both event condition 1 and 2) conditions. Table 4.3-7 summarizes the trip distributions in the immediate vicinity of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4.3-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MOTORIZED VEHICLE TRIP DISTRIBUTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via First Street campus Entrance and Old Davis Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via I-80 / Old Davis Road Interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To / from the east</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To / from the west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: DKS Associates, 2001.*

As shown in Table 4.3-7, under non-event conditions, approximately 48 percent of peak hour trips are anticipated to use the I-80 interchange compared to 75 percent under event conditions. The remaining 52 percent (under Non-event conditions) and 25 percent (under event conditions) would access the project via roadways in the City of Davis.

**Roadway Operating Conditions**

**Non-Event Condition**

Trips anticipated to be generated by the project under non-event conditions were added to existing traffic volumes in accordance with the trip distribution patterns. Existing traffic in the vicinity of the site (through-traffic and traffic associated with the parking areas) was reassigned to the new roadway system and parking areas currently under construction. Tables 4.3-8 and 4.3-9 summarize a.m. and p.m. peak hour intersection operating conditions with the project during non-event conditions.

The project does not result in any additional intersections violating LOS standards beyond those which would occur without the project. Under the non-event condition, the project would contribute traffic to the intersections in the City of Davis that operate at LOS “F” under existing conditions: Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street and Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive. Although this LOS exceeds standards of significance identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR, it does not exceed the City's current LOS standards (LOS “F” is acceptable in the Core Area of the City). The City of Davis has recently installed a northbound right turn lane on Richards Boulevard at its intersection with First/E Streets. This improvement provides additional capacity in the corridor, but does not eliminate the extensive queuing and LOS “F” conditions. No further feasible improvements have been identified for the Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street intersection due to the restricted nature of the Richards Boulevard underpass.
# TABLE 4.3-8

## A.M. PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION OPERATING CONDITIONS NON-EVENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersecting Roadways</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (seconds)</td>
<td>LOS ¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>Hutchison Dr.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins Road</td>
<td>Hutchison Dr.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>Hutchison Dr.</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>Hutchison Dr.</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci. Drive</td>
<td>Hutchison Dr.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>Hutchison Dr.</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>Orchard Park Dr.</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>Garrod Dr.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>Realigned Old Davis Road</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>I-80 WB Ramps</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>I-80 EB Ramps</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Dr.</td>
<td>Realigned Old Davis Road</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Avenue</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Way</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>Third Street</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>First Street</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Drive</td>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>First Street</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Street</td>
<td>First Street</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>First Street / E Street</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>Olive Dr.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 EB Ramps</td>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Park Dr.</td>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Level of Service. Bold indicates conditions exceeding the standards of significance.

### TABLE 4.3-9

**P.M. PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION OPERATING CONDITIONS NON-EVENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersecting Roadways</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (seconds)</td>
<td>LOS ¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins Road</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci. Drive</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Dr.</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Avenue</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Way</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Drive</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Street</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 EB Ramps</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Park Dr.</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Level of Service. **Bold** indicates conditions exceeding the standards of significance.

*Source: Analysis by DKS Associates, 2001.*
The 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised, identified the following mitigation measure for the intersection of Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, that is incorporated into the proposed project to mitigate traffic impacts:

- **LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b)** - In cooperation with other responsible jurisdictions, the Campus shall monitor a.m. and p.m. peak hour traffic operations at critical intersections in the Campus vicinity on a regular basis (at least every three years). To the extent that TSM measures are successful, some roadway improvements may be avoided. Based upon the existing Campus mode share and trip generation rates assumed in this analysis, the following physical improvements are intended to reduce the magnitude of this impact.

  (e) Widen the eastbound Olive Drive approach to the intersection of Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, to provide a right turn lane, combined right turn and through lane, and a left turn lane.

1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 (b) (e) recommends modifications to the Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive intersection, however, these modifications are within the jurisdiction of the City of Davis and not the University to implement. In addition, even if modifications were implemented, the intersection would remain operating at LOS “F” due to the restricted nature of the Richards Boulevard underpass. The City of Davis has decided to maintain the Richards Boulevard underpass at its current restricted two-lane configuration. Consequently, since traffic into and out of downtown Davis is metered by the underpass, queuing would extend into the subject intersections. As identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised, the continued exceedance of 1994 LRDP standards of significance at the intersections of Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street and Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive under non-event conditions would be significant and unavoidable.

**Event Conditions**

Trips anticipated to be generated under event condition 1 were added to the non-event traffic in accordance with the trip distribution patterns. Tables 4.3-10 and 4.3-11 summarize a.m. and p.m. peak hour intersection operating conditions with the project during event condition 1. Additional trips anticipated to be generated under event condition 2 were added to the event condition 1 traffic in accordance with the trip distribution patterns. Tables 4.3-12 and 4.3-13 summarize a.m. and p.m. peak hour intersection operating conditions with the project during event condition 2.

Increases in traffic volumes from event condition 1 would not result in any exceedances of the event standard of significance at intersections not already impacted under existing conditions. Increases in traffic volumes resulting from event condition 2 would contribute traffic to these intersections and would also reduce the LOS at California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road from “C” under the non-event scenario to LOS “F” during the a.m. peak hour (this intersection would operate at LOS “C” in the p.m. peak hour). The impact at the intersection of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road would be significant. The California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road intersection would operate at a reduced LOS because the southbound stop sign controlled California Avenue left turn approach to the intersection would
### TABLE 4.3-10

**A.M. PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION OPERATING CONDITIONS EVENT CONDITION 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersecting Roadways</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (seconds)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins Road</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci. Drive</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Dr.</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Avenue</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Way</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Drive</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Street</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 EB Ramps</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Park Dr.</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Level of Service. *Bold* indicates conditions exceeding the standards of significance.

**TABLE 4.3-11**

**P.M. PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION OPERATING CONDITIONS**

**EVENT CONDITION 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersecting Roadways</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (seconds)</td>
<td>Delay (seconds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins Road</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci. Drive</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Dr.</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Avenue</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Way</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Drive</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Street</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 EB Ramps</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Park Dr.</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹: Level of Service. **Bold** indicates conditions exceeding the standards of significance.

### TABLE 4.3-12

**A.M. PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION OPERATING CONDITIONS**

**EVENT CONDITION 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersecting Roadways</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (seconds)</td>
<td>LOS ¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>Hutchison Dr.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins Road</td>
<td>Hutchison Dr.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>Hutchison Dr.</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>Hutchison Dr.</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci. Drive</td>
<td>Hutchison Dr.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>Hutchison Dr.</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>Orchard Park Dr.</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>Garrod Dr.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>Realigned Old Davis Road</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>I-80 WB Ramps</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>I-80 EB Ramps</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Dr.</td>
<td>Realigned Old Davis Road</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Avenue</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Way</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>Russell Blvd.</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>Third Street</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>First Street</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Drive</td>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>First Street</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Street</td>
<td>First Street</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>First Street / E Street</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>Olive Dr.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 EB Ramps</td>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Park Dr.</td>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Level of Service. **Bold** indicates conditions exceeding the standards of significance.

*Source: Analysis by DKS Associates, 2001.*
### TABLE 4.3-13

**P.M. PEAK HOUR INTERSECTION OPERATING CONDITIONS**

**EVENT CONDITION 2**

| Intersecting Roadways | Without Project |  | With Project |  |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                         | **Delay (seconds)** | **LOS 1** | **Delay (seconds)** | **LOS 1** |
| County Road 98          | Russell Blvd.    | 9.8           | A                | 9.8           | A               |
| SR 113 SB Ramp          | Russell Blvd.    | 5.4           | A                | 5.6           | A               |
| SR 113 NB Ramp          | Russell Blvd.    | 24.8          | C                | 26.4          | C               |
| County Road 98          | Hutchison Dr.    | 4.9           | A                | 4.9           | A               |
| Hopkins Road            | Hutchison Dr.    | 3.0           | A                | 3.0           | A               |
| SR 113 SB Ramp          | Hutchison Dr.    | 1.9           | A                | 1.9           | A               |
| SR 113 NB Ramp          | Hutchison Dr.    | 0.4           | A                | 0.4           | A               |
| Health Sci. Drive       | Hutchison Dr.    | 5.1           | A                | 5.1           | A               |
| La Rue Road             | Hutchison Dr.    | 14.9          | B                | 14.9          | B               |
| La Rue Road             | La Rue Road      | 30.5          | C                | 30.5          | C               |
| La Rue Road             | Orchard Park Dr. | 17.3          | B                | 17.3          | B               |
| La Rue Road             | Garrod Dr.       | 2.6           | A                | 2.5           | A               |
| California Ave.         | Russell Blvd.    | 2.2           | A                | 2.2           | A               |
| California Ave.         | Old Davis Road   | 10.5          | B                | 10.6          | B               |
| California Ave.         | Realign Old Davis Road | 7.1 | A | 17.7 | B |
| Old Davis Road          | I-80 WB Ramps    | 1.7           | A                | 1.3           | A               |
| Old Davis Road          | I-80 EB Ramps    | 6.6           | A                | 10.3          | B               |
| Mrak Hall Dr.           | Realign Old Davis Road | 14.8 | B | 23.4 | C |
| Oak Avenue              | Russell Blvd.    | 5.8           | A                | 5.8           | A               |
| Howard Way              | Russell Blvd.    | 23.3          | C                | 23.3          | C               |
| A Street                | Russell Blvd.    | 11.2          | B                | 11.3          | B               |
| B Street                | Russell Blvd.    | 27.4          | C                | 28.0          | C               |
| B Street                | Third Street     | 8.7           | A                | 8.9           | A               |
| A Street                | First Street     | 8.3           | A                | 9.7           | A               |
| A Street                | Old Davis Road   | 10.0          | A                | 14.5          | B               |
| Mrak Hall Drive         | Old Davis Road   | 10.8          | B                | 16.1          | C               |
| B Street                | First Street     | 18.8          | C                | 23.8          | C               |
| D Street                | First Street     | 16.1          | B                | 18.7          | B               |
| Richards Blvd.          | First Street / E Street | >80 | F | >80 | F |
| Richards Blvd.          | Olive Dr.        | >80           | F                | >80           | F               |
| I-80 EB Ramps           | Richards Blvd.   | 44.4          | D                | 54.0          | D               |
| Research Park Dr.       | Richards Blvd.   | 42.9          | D                | 44.4          | D               |

1. Level of Service. Bold indicates conditions exceeding the standards of significance.

**Source:** Analysis by DKS Associates, 2001.
experience long delays due to a lack of suitable gaps on the uncontrolled eastbound Realigned Old Davis Road approach to the intersection. Manual traffic control at this intersection during event conditions in the a.m. peak hour would provide gaps for the southbound left turn traffic and would alleviate unacceptable operating conditions.

However, this impact would occur very rarely, if ever, because event condition 2 represents the worst possible traffic scenario associated with project implementation. As previously discussed, typical daytime events at the conference center are expected to be campus-oriented; therefore, the number of new trips would be less than those associated with event condition 2, since campus participants would already be on campus. The most likely non-campus midday event that could fully utilize the auditorium would involve a program for school students who would most likely travel by bus, van, or car pool. Also, event condition 2 assumes that event beginning and ending times coincide with the peak commuter periods. Different beginning and ending times would result in fewer new trips generated during the critical commuter a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Therefore, the event condition 2 analysis greatly overestimates the traffic impacts that would be created by more typical event conditions.

Under event conditions, the project would contribute additional traffic to the intersections in the City of Davis that operate at LOS “F” under existing conditions (Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street and Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive). As discussed under non-event conditions, recent improvements by the City of Davis to the Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street intersection do not eliminate the LOS “F” conditions. No further feasible improvements have been identified. As also discussed above under non-event conditions, 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b)(e) recommends modifications to the Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive intersection, however, these modifications are within the jurisdiction of the City of Davis and not the University to implement. Further, even if modifications were implemented, the intersection would remain operating at LOS “F” due to the restricted nature of the Richards Boulevard underpass. The City of Davis has decided to maintain the Richards Boulevard underpass at its current restricted two-lane configuration. Consequently, since traffic into and out of downtown Davis is metered by the underpass, queuing would extend into the subject intersections. Event conditions modeled for the analysis would contribute to continual LOS “F” conditions at the intersection of Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, and Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive. As identified in the 1994 LRDP, as revised, the continued exceedance of 1994 LRDP standards of significance at the intersections of Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street and Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive under event conditions would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(a) would reduce the project-specific impact at the intersection of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) would reduce the magnitude of this impact for the intersection of Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, but it would remain significant and unavoidable.
4.3-1(a) The campus shall provide manual traffic control prior to and following major events at the conference center when event arrival and departure would coincide with weekday peak hour traffic.

4.3-1(b) Implement 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b)(e) for the intersection of Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive.

Manual traffic control would consist of a traffic control officer allocating right-of-way in a similar manner to a traffic signal. With manual traffic control, employed by a properly trained traffic control officer at the intersection of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road, analysis indicates that the campus event LOS would not be exceeded. Under non-event and event conditions, the project would contribute traffic to the Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street and Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive intersections, which currently operate at LOS “F”. Although this LOS exceeds standards of significance identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR, it does not exceed the City’s current LOS standards (LOS “F” is acceptable in the Core Area of the City). No further feasible improvements have been identified for the Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street intersection. Although 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b)(e) recommends modifications to the Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive intersection, these modifications would not improve the intersection’s LOS. These impacts are due to the restricted nature of the Richards Boulevard underpass. The City of Davis decided to maintain the Richards Boulevard underpass at its current restricted two-lane configuration. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

4.3-2 Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increased demand for parking on campus. This is considered a less-than-significant impact.

Existing parking facilities in the project vicinity offer 1,576 permit spaces that would accommodate employees associated with the proposed project. Approximately 100 surface parking spaces (for overnight guests, restaurant and pub patrons, and Graduate School of Management and University Relations visitors) would be provided on-site immediately south of the proposed Graduate School of Management Building (see Figure 3-4). Approximately 75 existing parking spaces in Parking Lot 1 would be provided off the project site and immediately to the south for hotel guests and for restaurant and pub patrons as needed. Parking for conference attendees would be available in existing visitor parking spaces near the project site, including approximately 785 surface parking spaces in Parking Lots 1 and 2 (approximately 638 remaining spaces in Lot 1 and 147 spaces in Lot 2). In addition, 716 visitor parking spaces would be available for conference attendees in the South Entry Parking Structure on weekends and after 5:00 p.m. on weekdays. With special arrangement, visitor parking spaces in the parking structure could be made available for attendees before 5:00 pm on weekdays. Winter 2001 Parking utilization was 35 percent for Parking Lot 1, 33 percent for Parking Lot 2, and 33 percent for the South Entry Parking Structure.

Table 4.3-14 shows the number of available non-stacked parking spaces in Lots 1 and 2 and the South Entry Parking Structure that would be available to the proposed project assuming Winter 2001 parking utilization percentages. Winter parking utilization percentages are used because they represent a highest demand for parking due to poor weather conditions. As shown in Table 4.3-14, 1,168 non-stacked parking spaces would be available to accommodate the proposed project.
TABLE 4.3-14

AVAILABLE PARKING SPACES (NON-STACKED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Spaces</th>
<th>Percent Utilization</th>
<th>Available Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot 1</td>
<td>638*</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot 2</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Entry Parking Structure</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Site Parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Assumes 75 spaces available for the proposed project
² 75 spaces from Parking Lot 1’s existing inventory

Non-Event Conditions

For non-event conditions, there would be adequate parking on campus in the South Entry area to accommodate the proposed project. The 375 employees associated with the project would generate a need for 233 parking spaces assuming 1997 mode split data, which shows that 63 percent of campus employees drive. As described above and shown in Table 4.3-14, a total of approximately 1,168 spaces would be available including the approximately 100 surface parking spaces (for overnight guests, restaurant and pub patrons, and Graduate School of Management and University Relations visitors), which would be provided on-site immediately south of the proposed Graduate School of Management Building. In addition, approximately 75 existing parking spaces in Parking Lot 1 would also be provided off the project site and immediately to the south for hotel guests and restaurant and pub patrons. The peak demand period for guest room parking is overnight; during this time period, most campus parking is vacant. If the on-site guest room parking is not adequate, overflow parking can be readily accommodated in adjacent parking lots in the South Entry area. Therefore, additional parking demand resulting from non-event project use would be adequately accommodated and impacts associated with non-event conditions are less than significant.

Event Conditions

Under worse case event conditions (event condition 2), parking demand is estimated to be approximately 890 parking spaces, including:

- Employees: 233 parking spaces (see discussion under Non-event conditions);
- Conference Attendees: 500 attendees maximum and assuming all drive at 1.2 attendees per car (see Appendix F of this DEIR) would result in the need for 417 parking spaces; and
- Center for the Performing Arts: 1,800 attendees maximum and assuming 1/3 arrive by car with 2.5 people per car (see Appendix F of this DEIR) would result in the need for 240 parking spaces.

In addition, UC Davis Transportation and Parking Services (TAPS) could implement attendant-assisted parking (i.e., stacked parking) for Parking Lots 1 and 2, and the South Entry Parking Structure on an as-needed basis. The use of stacked parking would add a total of 219 spaces to
Parking Lot 1, 60 spaces to Parking Lot 2 and 257 spaces to the South Entry Parking Structure for a total of 536 additional parking spaces. Without stacked parking, a total of 1,168 spaces would be available to meet the maximum event condition demand of 890 parking spaces. With stacked parking a total of 1,704 parking spaces would be available. Therefore, additional parking demand resulting from event project use would be adequately accommodated and impacts associated with event conditions would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

4.3-2 None required.

Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Background

Cumulative impacts of campus growth through 2005-06 on transportation and circulation issues are addressed in Section 4.3 of the 1994 LRDP EIR; in Chapter 8 of the 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR; and in Section 3 of the Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Laboratory Facilities Focused Tiered EIR. Appendix C, Amendments to the 1994 LRDP and Revisions to the 1994 LRDP EIR contains a detailed discussion of amendments to the 1994 LRDP and revisions to the 1994 LRDP EIR.

The 1994 LRDP EIR and each subsequent study have included campus growth in the South Entry portion of the campus associated with a new academic building. Specifically, in the South Entry portion of the campus, a conference center, 150-room hotel, and academic building were assumed in 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR and in subsequent analyses of cumulative conditions. It should be noted that higher population projections for the Health Sciences District area of campus were incorporated into the traffic model, but the modeled population in other parts of the campus was not decreased to offset this growth. Therefore, campus population projections used in the updated cumulative transportation analyses were higher than the campus-wide totals evaluated in the 1994 LRDP EIR transportation analysis. As such, the updated cumulative transportation analyses are conservative as they over-estimate the traffic volumes associated with campus growth approved under the 1994 LRDP.

It should also be noted that the currently proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project includes a 75-room hotel instead of the 150-room hotel included in the updated cumulative traffic analysis. Therefore, the cumulative traffic analysis provides a conservative estimate of traffic volumes that would be higher than those associated with the proposed project. The over-estimation of traffic volumes results in the calculation of traffic operating conditions that would be worse than those associated with the project as currently proposed.

2005-06 Trip Generation

Table 4.3-15 summarizes the motorized vehicle trip generation associated with growth anticipated under the 1994 LRDP, as amended. Daily cumulative traffic volume levels for
TABLE 4.3-15

CUMULATIVE MOTORIZED VEHICLE TRIP GENERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Existing Campus</th>
<th>Exiting Campus</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entering Campus</td>
<td>Exiting Campus</td>
<td>Entering Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M. Peak Hour¹</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>4,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.M. Peak Hour¹</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>1,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of Average Weekday</td>
<td>22,580</td>
<td>24,190</td>
<td>26,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Weekday²</td>
<td>27,930</td>
<td>28,460</td>
<td>32,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Time period of peak hour varies by location on campus. For analysis purpose, the peak volume at each location had been considered.
² Based upon Tuesday through Thursday conditions.


Motorized vehicle entering and exiting the campus are anticipated to increase by approximately 16 percent, increasing the sum of the trips entering and exiting the campus from approximately 56,390 to 65,620.

4.3-3 Cumulative increases in traffic volumes under non-event conditions in relationship to the capacity of the future transportation network would result in LOS exceedances. This is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

Table 4.3-16 summarizes cumulative a.m. and p.m. peak hour intersection operating conditions under non-event conditions. As shown in Table 4.3-16, the following five intersections would exceed 1994 LRDP EIR LOS standards of significance:

- California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road (LOS “E” during a.m. peak hour);
- Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street (LOS “F” during a.m. and p.m. peak hours);
- Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive (LOS “F” during a.m. and p.m. peak hours);
- Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramp (LOS “F” during a.m. and p.m. peak hours); and
- Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive (LOS “F” during p.m. peak hour).

All of these intersections were identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised as exceeding standards of significance. The 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised, identified the following mitigation measures, that are incorporated into the proposed project, to mitigate cumulative traffic impacts:

- **LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(a)** - The Campus shall continue to actively pursue a program of Transportation System Management (TSM) strategies to reduce reliance on travel to and from Campus by private automobile, particularly single-occupant peak period travel. As described in the Setting section, the Campus currently has an extensive TSM program. TSM strategies include the development of a comprehensive bicycle circulation network, including a bicycle/pedestrian precinct in core area of Central Campus; increased parking fees; transit planning and subsidies; carpool and vanpool...
### TABLE 4.3-16

**CUMULATIVE NON-EVENT PEAK HOUR OPERATING CONDITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersecting Roadways</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (seconds)</td>
<td>LOS (^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins Road</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci. Drive</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Dr.</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Avenue</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Way</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Drive</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Street</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 EB Ramps</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Park Dr.</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Level of Service. **Bold** indicates conditions exceeding the standards of significance.  
matching service, and development and incentive program; campus shuttle systems, including shuttles to UC Davis Medical Center in Sacramento and UC Berkeley, public awareness programs, park and ride lot identification, and telecommuting.

- **LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b)** - In cooperation with other responsible jurisdictions, the Campus shall monitor a.m. and p.m. peak hour traffic operations at critical intersections in the Campus vicinity on a regular basis (at least every three years). To the extent that TSM measures are successful, some roadway improvements may be avoided. Based upon the existing Campus mode share and trip generation rates assumed in this analysis, the following physical improvements are intended to reduce the magnitude of this impact.

  (a) Realign Old Davis Road as shown in the LRDP and reconstruct the intersection of Old Davis and California Avenue. Provide separate right and left turn lanes on the California Avenue approach and a separate left turn lane on the eastbound Old Davis Road approach and install a traffic signal. The realignment will extend to the intersection of Old Davis Road and A Street.

  (b) At the intersection of I-80 Eastbound Ramps and Richards Boulevard, add an additional turn lane on the ramp approach to the intersection, to provide a left turn lane, combined right and left turn lane, and a right turn lane.

  (c) Restripe the southbound Research Park Drive approach to the intersection with Richards Boulevard/Cowell Boulevard to provide a combined through/left turn lane and a separate exclusive right turn lane.

  (d) Signalize the intersection of First and B Streets.

  (e) Widen the eastbound Olive Drive approach to the intersection of Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, to provide a right turn lane, combined right turn and through lane, and a left turn lane.

  (f) The campus will monitor traffic volumes at the Hutchison Drive and Health Sciences Drive intersection every three years. If and when signalization is warranted based on traffic volumes, the campus will install a new traffic signal at this location.

Consistent with 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(a), specific types of measures have been undertaken by the campus to reduce the number of automobiles used including:

- a comprehensive bicycle circulation network
- parking fees
- transit planning and subsidies
- promotion of carpools, vanpools, park and ride, and rideshare programs and incentives
- shuttle bus systems
- telecommuting, and
- public awareness programs.

1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b), as revised by the 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR and the Veterinary Medicine Laboratory and Equine Athletic Performance Facilities Focused Tiered EIR (see Appendix C of this DEIR), requires traffic
monitoring at key intersections on a regular basis and proposes physical changes to roadways and intersections (which would result in increased speed, less idling time, etc.). Consistent with 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b), the campus conducted monitoring at key intersections in the campus vicinity in March 2001. The results of this monitoring are shown in Table 4.3-4.

Consistent with the proposed physical changes, the campus is in the process of realigning Old Davis Road, and the City of Davis has implemented changes to the intersections of First and B Streets and Research Park Drive and Richards Boulevard. Complete implementation of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.3-1(b)(a) would reduce the LOS at the intersection of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to an acceptable level. There is now a four-way stop at the intersection of First and B Streets and the City has changed the lane geometry and signal timing and phasing at the intersection of Research Park Drive and Richards Boulevard. This improvement provides additional capacity in the corridor, but does not eliminate the extensive queuing and LOS “F” conditions. No further feasible improvements have been identified for the Richards Boulevard/First Street/E Street intersection due to the restricted nature of the Richards Boulevard underpass. While 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) also proposes changes to the intersections of Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound ramps and Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, these changes would not be sufficient to improve the LOS at these intersections to an acceptable level. The City of Davis has decided to maintain the Richards Boulevard underpass at its current restricted two-lane configuration. Consequently, since traffic into and out of downtown Davis is metered by the underpass, queuing will extend into the subject intersections.

1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) also recommends modification that would improve the LOS at Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive to an acceptable level. However, this mitigation is outside the jurisdiction of the University to implement. The City has modified the lane geometry and signal timing, and phasing at this intersection, but these improvements have not reduced the intersection’s LOS to an acceptable level.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would reduce the magnitude of cumulative non-event traffic levels; however, the feasibility and/or implementation of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) (b) through (e) cannot be guaranteed by the University of California because it falls within other jurisdictions to enforce and monitor. This cumulative impact was adequately analyzed in the 1994 LRDP EIR and fully addressed by the Findings and Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 1994 LRDP and certification of the 1994 LRDP EIR. No further mitigation beyond that adopted as part of the 1994 LRDP EIR is available to reduce this cumulative impact for non-event conditions to a less-than-significant level. This is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

4.3-3 None available beyond 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1.
4.3-4 Cumulative increases in traffic volumes under event conditions in relationship to the capacity of the future transportation network would contribute to LOS exceedances. This is considered a **significant and unavoidable impact**.

Tables 4.3-17 and 4.3-18 summarize cumulative a.m. and p.m. peak hour intersection operating conditions under event condition 1. Tables 4.3-19 and 4.3-20 summarize cumulative a.m. and p.m. peak hour intersection operating conditions under event condition 2. Under event conditions, the project would continue to contribute traffic to the five intersections already reported to be violating the 1994 LRDP EIR LOS standards under cumulative with project (non-event) conditions. As discussed above, due to the lack of feasible mitigation and the location outside the jurisdiction of the University, LOS exceedances at the Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramps, and Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

Both cumulative event conditions 1 and 2 would further reduce the LOS at the intersection of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to LOS “F” (during cumulative event condition 1 the intersection would experience LOS “F” during the a.m. peak hour and LOS “E” during the p.m. peak hour, and during cumulative event condition 2 it would experience LOS “F” during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours). Prior to mitigation, this would result in an exceedance of event standards during both event condition 1 and 2 and is considered a **significant impact** at this intersection.

Increases in traffic volumes under cumulative event condition 1 would also reduce the LOS of the Old Davis Road/I-80 Eastbound Ramp intersection to LOS “F” during the a.m. peak hour, which would exceed event standards (the intersection would operate at LOS “E” during the p.m. peak hour). Increases in traffic volumes under cumulative event condition 2 would further reduce this intersection to LOS “F” during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Prior to mitigation, this would result in an exceedance of event standards during both event condition 1 and 2 and is considered a **significant impact** at this intersection.

Cumulative event condition 2 would also reduce the Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road intersection to LOS “E” during the p.m. peak hour for no more than one hour before and one hour after an event, but this would not exceed the standards of significance for event conditions (LOS “F” for less than one hour before and after an event). This is considered a **less-than-significant impact** at this intersection.

As previously discussed, LOS experienced under event conditions would occur very rarely, if ever. Under event conditions 1, typical events at the conference center are expected to be campus-oriented, and therefore, event condition 1 overestimates the traffic impacts that would be created by a more typical academic conference. Under event condition 2, typical daytime events at the conference center are expected to be campus-oriented and the number of new trips would be less than those associated with event condition 2, since campus participants would already be on campus. The most likely non-campus midday event that could fully utilize the auditorium would involve a program for school students who would most likely travel by bus, van, or car pool. Therefore, the event condition 2 analysis greatly overestimates the traffic impacts that would be created by more typical event conditions.
### TABLE 4.3-17

**CUMULATIVE EVENT CONDITION 1**  
**A.M. PEAK HOUR OPERATING CONDITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersecting Roadways</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (seconds)</td>
<td>LOS 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins Road</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci. Drive</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Dr.</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Avenue</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Way</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Drive</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Street</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 EB Ramps</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Park Dr.</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Level of Service. Bold indicates conditions exceeding the standards of significance.  
### TABLE 4.3-18

**CUMULATIVE EVENT CONDITION 1**

**P.M. PEAK HOUR OPERATING CONDITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersecting Roadways</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (seconds)</td>
<td>LOS ¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins Road</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci. Drive</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Dr.</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Avenue</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Way</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Drive</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Street</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 EB Ramps</td>
<td>&gt;180</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Park Dr.</td>
<td>173.6</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Level of Service. **Bold** indicates conditions exceeding the standards of significance.

## TABLE 4.3-19

### CUMULATIVE EVENT CONDITION 2

#### A.M. PEAK HOUR OPERATING CONDITIONS

| Intersecting Roadways | Delay (seconds) | LOS ¹ | Without Project | | Delay (seconds) | LOS ¹ | With Project |
|------------------------|-----------------|-------|----------------||-----------------|-------|--------------|
| County Road 98         | 9.9             | A     | Russell Blvd.  | | 9.9             | A     | Russell Blvd. |
| SR 113 SB Ramp         | 22.9            | C     | Russell Blvd.  | | 23.1            | C     | Russell Blvd. |
| SR 113 NB Ramp         | 31.1            | C     | Russell Blvd.  | | 31.1            | C     | Russell Blvd. |
| County Road 98         | 4.7             | A     | Hutchison Dr.  | | 4.7             | A     | Hutchison Dr. |
| Hopkins Road           | 2.7             | A     | Hutchison Dr.  | | 2.7             | A     | Hutchison Dr. |
| SR 113 SB Ramp         | 16.0            | C     | Hutchison Dr.  | | 16.0            | C     | Hutchison Dr. |
| SR 113 NB Ramp         | 1.3             | A     | Hutchison Dr.  | | 1.3             | A     | Hutchison Dr. |
| Health Sci. Drive      | 1.6             | A     | Hutchison Dr.  | | 1.6             | A     | Hutchison Dr. |
| La Rue Road            | 8.3             | A     | Hutchison Dr.  | | 8.3             | A     | Hutchison Dr. |
| La Rue Road            | 23.8            | C     | Russell Blvd.  | | 23.9            | C     | Russell Blvd. |
| La Rue Road            | 16.0            | B     | Orchard Park Dr.| | 16.0            | B     | Orchard Park Dr.|
| La Rue Road            | 1.5             | A     | Garrod Dr.     | | 1.5             | A     | Garrod Dr.     |
| California Ave.        | 0.7             | A     | Russell Blvd.  | | 0.7             | A     | Russell Blvd.  |
| California Ave.        | 10.7            | B     | Old Davis Road | | 10.8            | B     | Old Davis Road |
| California Ave.        | 36.8            | E     | Realigned Old Davis Road | | 97.1            | F     | Realigned Old Davis Road |
| Old Davis Road         | 8.4             | A     | I-80 WB Ramps  | | 34.0            | D     | I-80 WB Ramps  |
| Old Davis Road         | 29.8            | D     | I-80 EB Ramps  | | 147.6           | F     | I-80 EB Ramps  |
| Mrak Hall Dr.          | 20.3            | C     | Realigned Old Davis Road | | 26.1            | C     | Realigned Old Davis Road |
| Oak Avenue             | 3.8             | A     | Russell Blvd.  | | 3.8             | A     | Russell Blvd.  |
| Howard Way             | 19.7            | B     | Russell Blvd.  | | 19.7            | B     | Russell Blvd.  |
| A Street               | 8.6             | A     | Russell Blvd.  | | 8.7             | A     | Russell Blvd.  |
| B Street               | 25.5            | C     | Russell Blvd.  | | 26.6            | C     | Russell Blvd.  |
| B Street               | 4.7             | A     | Third Street   | | 5.0             | A     | Third Street   |
| A Street               | 8.1             | A     | First Street   | | 8.6             | A     | First Street   |
| A Street               | 13.4            | B     | Old Davis Road | | 15.8            | C     | Old Davis Road |
| Mrak Hall Drive        | 16.3            | C     | Old Davis Road | | 23.3            | C     | Old Davis Road |
| B Street               | 22.0            | C     | First Street   | | 29.1            | D     | First Street   |
| D Street               | 10.0            | B     | First Street   | | 10.6            | B     | First Street   |
| Richards Blvd.         | >80             | F     | First Street / E Street | | >80             | F     | First Street / E Street |
| Richards Blvd.         | >80             | F     | Olive Dr.      | | >80             | F     | Olive Dr.      |
| I-80 EB Ramps          | 87.1            | F     | Richards Blvd. | | 89.5            | F     | Richards Blvd. |
| Research Park Dr.      | 51.9            | D     | Richards Blvd. | | 52.8            | D     | Richards Blvd. |

¹ Level of Service. Bold indicates conditions exceeding the standards of significance.

### TABLE 4.3-20

**CUMULATIVE EVENT CONDITION 2**

**P.M. PEAK HOUR OPERATING CONDITIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersecting Roadways</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (seconds)</td>
<td>LOS ¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road 98</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopkins Road</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 SB Ramp</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113 NB Ramp</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sci. Drive</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rue Road</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ave.</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Davis Road</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Dr.</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Avenue</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Way</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Street</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrak Hall Drive</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Street</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Street</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richards Blvd.</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 EB Ramps</td>
<td>&gt;180</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Park Dr.</td>
<td>173.6</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Level of Service. **Bold** indicates conditions exceeding the standards of significance.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-4(a) and (b) would reduce this cumulative impact for the intersection of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-4(a) would reduce this cumulative impact for the intersections of Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramp, and Mrak Hall and Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3-4(b) would reduce the magnitude of this cumulative impact for the intersections of Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive, Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, and Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramp, but it would remain significant and unavoidable.

4.3-4(a) Implement Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 for the intersections of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road, Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramp, and Mrak Hall and Old Davis Road.

4.3-4(b) Implement 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1.

The following discussion summarizes the relationship of the contribution of event condition traffic to the capacity of each of the affected intersections.

California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road

This campus intersection exhibits LOS “F” conditions under both cumulative event condition 1 and event condition 2. The southbound, stop sign controlled California Avenue left turn approach to the intersection would experience long delays due to a lack of suitable gaps on the uncontrolled eastbound Realigned Old Davis Road approach to the intersection. 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) (above) identifies physical improvements for this intersection that would be implemented when traffic monitoring identifies LOS exceedance during the cumulative non-event scenario. This mitigation would reduce the traffic impacts at this intersection to a less-than-significant level. In addition, Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 (also presented above) would provide manual traffic control at this intersection during event conditions when event arrival and departure coincide with peak hour traffic. This would provide gaps for the southbound left turn traffic and would alleviate unacceptable operating conditions for events. Manual traffic control would consist of a traffic control officer allocating right-of-way in a similar manner to a traffic signal. With manual traffic control employed by a properly trained traffic control officer, analysis indicates that the 1994 LRDP EIR standard of significance for campus roadways under event conditions would not be exceeded. The impact at this intersection would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramp

Under event conditions, this unsignalized intersection would exhibit LOS “E” or “F” on the eastbound stop sign controlled approach to the intersection. Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 at this intersection during infrequent scenarios when event arrival and departure coincide with peak hour traffic, would ensure manual traffic control to provide gaps
for the eastbound traffic and alleviate the operating difficulties. Manual traffic control would consist of a traffic control officer allocating right of way in a similar manner to a traffic signal. With manual traffic control employed by a properly trained traffic control officer, analysis indicates that the 1994 LRDP EIR standard of significance for campus roadways under event conditions would not be exceeded. This manual traffic control would also assure that traffic does not queue onto the freeway mainline. The impact at this intersection would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road

The unsignalized intersection of Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road exhibits LOS “E” or better under cumulative event conditions. Therefore, this intersection would not exceed the 1994 LRDP EIR standard of significance for campus roadways under event conditions. The impact at this intersection would be less-than-significant.

Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive

This intersection is expected to operate at LOS “F” under cumulative event conditions (the intersection would operate at LOS “D” during cumulative non-event conditions). 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b)(c) recommends modifications to this intersection (see the discussion under Impact 4.3-3 for non-event conditions). The City of Davis has modified the lane geometry and signal timing and phasing at the intersection of Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive. This is consistent with the intent of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) for this intersection, but it does not reduce cumulative LOS to acceptable levels. Implementation of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) would improve this intersection to an acceptable LOS level, however, it is outside the jurisdiction of the University to implement these improvements. The contribution of vehicle trips to this intersection would exceed the 1994 LRDP EIR standard of significance of LOS “E” for City of Davis roadways outside the downtown core under event conditions. Therefore the impact at this intersection would be significant and unavoidable. No further mitigation is available to reduce this cumulative impact for event conditions to a less-than-significant level.

Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street

This intersection is expected to operate at LOS “F” under cumulative event (and non-event) conditions in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The City of Davis has recently installed a northbound right turn lane on Richards Boulevard at its intersection with First/E Streets. This improvement provides additional capacity in the corridor, but does not eliminate the extensive queuing and LOS “F” conditions. No further feasible improvements have been identified for this intersection. The City of Davis has decided to maintain the Richards Boulevard underpass, immediately south of this intersection, at its current restricted two-lane configuration. Consequently, since traffic into and out of downtown Davis is metered by the underpass, queuing will extend into the subject intersection. The contribution of vehicle trips to this intersection would exceed the 1994 LRDP EIR standard of significance for City of Davis roadways in the downtown core under event conditions because the intersection already operated at LOS F under existing conditions and greater than one hour delays would occur. Therefore the impact at this
interception would be significant and unavoidable. No further mitigation is available to reduce this cumulative impact for event conditions to a less-than-significant level.

Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive

This intersection would operate at LOS “F” under cumulative event conditions (and non-event conditions). Similar to the intersection of Richards Boulevard/E Street and First Street, no feasible improvements have been identified due to the decision of the City of Davis to maintain Richards Boulevard as a two-lane facility entering the downtown. 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b)(e) recommends modifications to this intersection (see the discussion under Impact 4.3-3 for non-event conditions). However, it is outside the jurisdiction of the University to implement these improvements. In addition, these improvements would not improve the intersection LOS under cumulative event (as well as non-event) conditions to a level that is acceptable given 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance. This is due to the restricted nature of the Richards Boulevard underpass. The City of Davis decided to maintain the Richards Boulevard underpass at its current restricted two-lane configuration. The contribution of vehicle trips to this intersection would exceed the 1994 LRDP EIR standard of significance of LOS “E” for City of Davis roadways outside the downtown core under event conditions. Therefore the impact at this intersection would be significant and unavoidable. No further mitigation is available to reduce this cumulative impact for event-conditions to a less-than-significant level.

Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramp

This intersection is expected to operate at LOS “F” under cumulative event conditions. As identified in previous analysis of cumulative conditions (e.g., 1994 LRDP EIR [Section 4.3] and 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR [Chapter 8]), no feasible improvement has been identified to reduce LOS to an acceptable level at this location. To reach an acceptable LOS, substantial roadway widening and/or interchange modification would be required. 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b)(b) recommends modifications to this intersection (see the discussion under Impact 4.3-3 for non-event conditions); it is within the jurisdiction of the City of Davis and Caltrans to determine and implement necessary and feasible changes to this intersection. The contribution of vehicle trips to this intersection would exceed the 1994 LRDP EIR standard of significance of LOS “E” for City of Davis roadways outside the downtown core under event conditions. Therefore the impact at this intersection would be significant and unavoidable. No further mitigation is available to reduce this cumulative impact for event-conditions to a less-than-significant level.

Freeway Analysis

In accordance with the request of Caltrans, analyses of the I-80 interchange with Old Davis Road have been conducted for a twenty-year time horizon. Because the campus has not developed specific land use and transportation plans for this horizon, regional traffic forecasts for the year 2022 developed by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) were utilized for the purposes of the freeway operations analysis. Detailed LOS calculations for these analyses and all capacity analyses in this report are included in the technical appendix for Appendix F. The technical appendix is on file and available for review during normal operating hours at the
Analysis of the I-80 interchange with Old Davis Road was conducted in accordance with 2000 HCM methods. Level of service is based upon traffic density. Table 4.3-21 applies the LOS definitions to ramp-freeway junction areas. Tables 4.3-22 and 4.3-23 summarize existing and existing plus project a.m. and p.m. peak hour operating conditions at the subject interchange. All of the freeway ramp junction areas operate at an acceptable LOS A or B. Year 2022 traffic volumes were developed from SACOG’s SACMET travel model. Tables 4.3-24 and 4.3-25 summarize projected a.m. and p.m. peak hour operating conditions at the subject interchange in 2022. All of the freeway ramp junction areas operate at an acceptable LOS A, B, or C.

**TABLE 4.3-21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service (LOS)</th>
<th>Maximum Density (Primary Measure) (Passenger Cars Per Mile Per Lane)</th>
<th>Minimum Speed (Secondary Measure) (Miles Per Hour)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt;35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**TABLE 4.3-22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainline</th>
<th>Ramp</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project Non-Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-80 Eastbound</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Road</td>
<td>8.37 A</td>
<td>8.67 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>2.78 A</td>
<td>2.82 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 Westbound</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Road</td>
<td>6.90 A</td>
<td>7.07 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>11.58 B</td>
<td>11.61 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp to SR 113 Northbound</td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>1.56 A</td>
<td>1.56 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp from SR 113 Southbound</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Road</td>
<td>4.37 A</td>
<td>4.37 A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4.3-23

**PEAK HOUR U.S. 50 FREEWAY RAMP JUNCTION OPERATING CONDITIONS**  
**BASELINE CONDITIONS – P.M. PEAK HOUR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainline</th>
<th>Ramp</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project Non-Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Density¹</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 Eastbound</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Road</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 Westbound</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Road</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp to SR 113</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Passenger cars per mile per lane.  

### TABLE 4.3-24

**PEAK HOUR U.S. 50 FREEWAY RAMP JUNCTION OPERATING CONDITIONS**  
**YEAR 2022 CONDITIONS – A.M. PEAK HOUR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainline</th>
<th>Ramp</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project Non-Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Density¹</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 Eastbound</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Road</td>
<td>14.87</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 Westbound</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Road</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp to SR 113</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Passenger cars per mile per lane.  
TABLE 4.3-25

PEAK HOUR U.S. 50 FREEWAY RAMP JUNCTION OPERATING CONDITIONS
YEAR 2022 CONDITIONS – P.M. PEAK HOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainline</th>
<th>Ramp</th>
<th>Without Project Density¹</th>
<th>Without Project LOS</th>
<th>With Project Non-Event Density¹</th>
<th>With Project Non-Event LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-80 Eastbound</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Rd</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance from Old Rd</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 Westbound</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Rd</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance from Old Rd</td>
<td>19.97</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp to SR 113</td>
<td>Entrance from Old Rd</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp from SR 113</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Rd</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹. Passenger cars per mile per lane.

Potential Cumulative Transportation and Circulation Effects through 2014-15

The campus has prepared a Cumulative Impacts Analysis, presented as Appendix D of this document, that serves to inform the public concerning all that is currently known about the campus’ potential growth through 2014-15. This analysis includes an evaluation of the possible cumulative transportation and circulation effects of anticipated development through 2014-15.

As discussed in Appendix D, cumulative growth through 2014-15 is anticipated to increase vehicle trips on campus roadways to approximately 74,600 trips per day in 2014-15, which is 8,980 trips per day beyond that projected for 2005-06. Given this increase through 2014-15, it is likely that additional elements of the roadway system that were not previously addressed in the 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised, would operate at levels that would exceed the campus’ standards of significance. However, detailed intersection impacts and mitigation measures cannot be identified at this time because the configuration of revised LRDP land uses has not yet been identified, and consideration of related impacts would be speculative. During preparation of the next LRDP EIR, the campus will develop a traffic model that incorporates this specific information, and intersections that would exceed standards of significance through 2014-15 will be identified. 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 (b) would be updated in the next LRDP to reflect these changes and to provide campus-sponsored mitigation measures to reduce any significant impacts to less-than-significant levels at campus intersections. However, 1994 LRDP EIR Impact 4.3-1 would remain significant and unavoidable because the University would not be able to guarantee intersection upgrades that are within other jurisdictions to implement. The availability of additional feasible mitigation measures will be investigated as part of the LRDP update process.

Campus growth through 2014-15 would also likely increase parking demand on campus over levels identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR (Impact 4.3-6). Continued compliance with mitigation identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR (Mitigation Measure 4.3-6) would provide transportation...
strategies to reduce automobile travel and parking demand, and would establish additional parking facilities as required. The campus anticipates that, with mitigation, this impact would continue to be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The campus will reexamine potential parking impacts and any new mitigation measures that may be required during the LRDP update process.
4.4 NOISE

Introduction

This section addresses the potential impacts attributed to increased noise levels associated with increased vehicle trips generated by the proposed project. All other impacts related to noise including construction noise and exposure of project occupants to significant noise sources (e.g., freeway traffic, the railroad tracks, and University Airport), were adequately addressed in the Tiered Initial Study prepared for this project (see Appendix A). All relevant information, including applicable environmental and regulatory setting, standards of significance, and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.4 of the 1994 LRDP EIR, Chapter 8 of the 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR, and Item 10 of the Center for the Arts Performance Hall and South Entry Roadway and Parking Improvements, are incorporated by reference and summarized below as appropriate. See Appendix C of this DEIR for more information.

Environmental Setting

Acoustic Fundamentals

Definitions of terms used in acoustics and background information on environmental acoustics are provided on pages 4.4-1 through 4.4-3 in the 1994 LRDP DEIR. The Day-Night Sound Level ($L_{dn}$) is a standard measure of noise impacts. This unit describes a receptor's cumulative noise exposure from all noise levels over a 24-hour period (values for noise levels between 10 PM and 7 AM are weighted to account for nighttime sensitivity).

Existing Noise Environment

The primary source of noise on- and off-campus is vehicle noise from roads and highways (I-80, SR 113, and local and regional roads) and railroad operations on the UPRR line. Aviation traffic, originating in the local area from the University Airport and Yolo County Airport, also adds to the ambient noise levels.

The project site is located in the South Entry area of the central campus, south of the Environmental Horticulture Building and gardens, southeast of the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center, east of the Center for the Performing Arts and the South Entry Quad (currently under construction), northeast of the South Entry Parking Structure, north of the UPRR line, and southwest of the community gardens at Solano Park Housing (see Figure 3-2). The proposed project site is within the 60 and 65 $L_{dn}$ contours shown on the 1987 City of Davis General Plan 2010 noise level projection map, included as Figure 4.4-6 in the 1994 LRDP EIR. The noise sources creating this contour are primarily the UPRR line and I-80 located south of the project site. The 2001 City of Davis General Plan Update does not show noise contours on the proposed
project site. Ambient noise levels at the Center for the Performing Arts site, located immediately west of the project site, were measured in 1998 and range from approximately 58 to 78 dBA.

Noise levels along local and regional roadways modeled for the 1994 LRDP EIR ranged from as low as 56 A-weighted decibels (dBA) $L_{dn}$ along County Road 32 at Russell Ranch to 76 $L_{dn}$ at 100 feet from the centerline of I-80 between SR 113 and Russell Boulevard (all west of the project site). Measurements of sound levels taken from acoustical studies performed between 1987 and 1993 at and near the campus range from 43 dBA $L_{eq}$ to 66 dBA $L_{eq}$. The higher noise levels were generally near busy roadways or sports fields (while in use). Measurements performed for the 1994 LRDP EIR were consistent with this range, with the exception of a few measurements at relatively quiet locations (all away from roadways) that were below 40 dBA $L_{eq}$.

**Noise-Sensitive Land Uses**

As stated on page 4.4-15 in the 1994 LRDP DEIR, some land uses are considered more sensitive to ambient noise levels than others due to the amount of exposure (in terms of both exposure time and insulation from noise) and the types of activities typically involved. Residences, motels and hotels, schools, libraries, churches, hospitals, nursing homes, auditoriums, parks, and other outdoor recreation areas are generally more sensitive to noise than are commercial and industrial land uses.

The area to the south of the proposed project includes a portion of Parking Lot 1, the UPRR tracks, I-80, and privately-owned agricultural fields in the City of Davis. These agricultural fields are currently zoned by the City of Davis for urban reserve. There are no existing noise-sensitive land uses in this area. Consistent with the City’s Urban reserve designation, this land could remain as agricultural use and/or be developed with University-related uses following further study. The Center for the Performing Arts, currently under construction to the west of the project site, would be a noise-sensitive land use. Noise-sensitive campus facilities to the north and east include academic and administrative functions at the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center and the Environmental Horticulture Building. Solano Park Student Housing, another noise-sensitive use, is located approximately one-quarter mile east of the project site. As described on page 4.4-11 in the 1994 LRDP DEIR, noise levels near Solano Park range from 60 to 62 CNEL. Noise at this location is dominated by traffic-related noise sources, and is also subject to high noise levels attributed to rail traffic on the UPRR line located adjacent to the housing area.

**Regulatory Setting**

Local, State, and federal noise guidelines and standards are provided on pages 4.4-3 through 4.4-18 in the 1994 LRDP DEIR. Noise compatibility guidelines recommended by the State are summarized in Figure 4.4-1 on page 4.4-4 in the 1994 LRDP DEIR. These guidelines were used to evaluate land use/noise compatibility for proposed land uses on campus (these guidelines are provided in Figure 4.4-1 of the 1994 LRDP EIR).
The State of California and the UC CEQA noise guidelines do not have specific standards for exterior noise levels. However, the 1990 State of California General Plan Guidelines offers guidance on acceptable noise exposure for several land uses, including transient lodging (see Figure 4.4-1 on page 4.4-4 in the 1994 LRDP DEIR). Normally acceptable noise exposures for motels and hotels, according to the General Plan Guidelines, range from 50 to 65 dB L_{dn}. Noise levels ranging from 60 to 70 dB L_{dn} are conditionally acceptable (requires detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements and must include noise attenuation features). According to the guidelines, office buildings (like the proposed conference center and the Graduate School of Management Building) are normally acceptable at noise levels up to 70 L_{dn}.

**Impacts And Mitigation Measures**

**Standards of Significance**

The State of California general plan noise exposure guidelines are used as the standards of significance for project impacts on the campus. Solano County, Yolo County, and the City of Davis general plan noise exposure guidelines and ordinances are used as the standards of significance for the project's impacts on noise receptors within Solano County, Yolo County, and the City of Davis jurisdictions, respectively.

The environmental analysis in the 1994 LRDP EIR considered a noise impact to be significant if campus or regional growth would:

- substantially increase the long-term ambient noise levels for adjoining areas by 5 dBA during project operation, or cause noise levels to exceed normally acceptable levels as defined by the State of California general plan noise element guidelines for receptors on the campus, Solano County general plan guidelines for receptors off-campus within Solano County, Yolo County general plan guidelines for receptors off-campus within Yolo County, City of Davis general plan guidelines for receptors off-campus within Davis, or Cal OSHA standards.

**Project-Specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

4.4-1 Motor vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would contribute to increased noise levels. This is considered a less-than-significant impact.

The proposed project includes operation of a conference center and hotel, and the Graduate School of Management Building, which would increase traffic volumes, as described in Impact 4.3-1 in Section 4.3, Transportation and Circulation of this DEIR.

As discussed in Impact 4.3-1, non-event and event condition traffic volumes would increase when compared to existing conditions. The increase in traffic levels is anticipated to result in an increase in traffic-generated noise levels over that which currently exists. Based on estimated increases in traffic volumes, described in Impact 4.3-1 and presented in Table 4.3-6, average weekday traffic volumes (entering and exiting the campus) when compared to existing conditions would increase from 46,770 to 48,510 for non-event conditions (a net increase of
For event condition 1 (full occupancy of conference center facilities), average weekday traffic volumes would increase to 49,762 (an increase of 2,992 trips over existing conditions); and for event condition 2 (full occupancy of conference center facilities and the performance hall), average weekday traffic volumes would increase to 50,562 (an increase of 3,792 trips over existing conditions). The increases in average weekday traffic volumes would range from approximately 4 to 8 percent over existing conditions. The increase in a.m. and p.m. peak hour traffic volumes would range from approximately three percent under non-event conditions to approximately 15 to 16 percent under event conditions when compared to existing (baseline) conditions. To achieve a noise increase of three dBA (which is considered perceptible), traffic volumes would need to double. Under either non-event and event conditions, traffic volumes would not double over current conditions; therefore, noise levels would not be anticipated to increase by three dBA.

As previously discussed, the proposed project site was identified as being within the 2010 projected 60 and 65 $L_{dn}$ contours shown in the 1987 City of Davis General Plan. The 2001 General Plan update does not show noise contours on the proposed project site. In 1998, measured noise levels immediately west of and adjacent to the project site ranged from 58 to 78 dBA (immediately adjacent to the UPRR line). According to the State of California General Plan Guidelines, normally acceptable noise exposure for hotel facilities (such as the proposed conference center and hotel facilities) is up to 65 $L_{dn}$. Noise levels between 60 and 70 $L_{dn}$ are acceptable with incorporation of noise attenuation features. According to the Guidelines, normally acceptable noise levels for uses such as the Graduate School of Management Building is up to 70 $L_{dn}$. An increase of less than three dBA would not result in the project being exposed to noise levels that exceed these guidelines. In addition, as discussed in the Tiered Initial Study (see Appendix A of this DEIR), the proposed project would incorporate noise attenuation features to ensure acceptable noise levels including: (1) locating guest rooms a minimum of 200 feet from the railroad line; (2) locating sound sensitive uses as far from the railroad line as feasible; (3) locating less sound-sensitive uses between the railroad line and the guest rooms to act as a buffer; and (4) use of construction materials and techniques to reduce interior sound to acceptable levels.

Traffic generated by the proposed project would not be anticipated to result in an increase in noise levels of 5 dBA or exceed established applicable noise guidelines, and therefore, would not exceed the standard of significance. Furthermore, increases in traffic volumes and associated noise levels under event conditions would be short-term and periodic in nature. This is a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures

4.4-1 None required.

Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The cumulative context for noise analysis is defined in the 1994 LRDP DEIR (page 5.2-2) as the City of Davis. Growth in the City of Davis, in combination with campus growth, would increase the number of vehicles, which would increase noise levels in the area.
4.4-2 Development allowed under the 1994 LRDP, in conjunction with the proposed project, and cumulative development in the Davis area, would result in increased traffic and other noise sources that could expose people and structures on- and off-campus to significant cumulative noise levels. This is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

The 1994 LRDP EIR and each subsequent study have included campus growth in the South Entry portion of the campus associated with a new academic building. Specifically, in the South Entry portion of the campus, a conference center, 150-room hotel, and academic building were assumed in 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR and in subsequent analyses of cumulative conditions. The campus population projections used in the updated cumulative transportation analyses were higher than the campus-wide totals evaluated in the 1994 LRDP EIR transportation analysis due to conservative modeling assumptions regarding the on-campus population in the Health Science District of the campus. Therefore, the updated cumulative transportation analyses are conservative as they over-estimate the traffic volumes associated with campus growth approved under the 1994 LRDP.

Cumulative impacts of campus growth through year 2005-06 on noise were addressed in Section 4.4 of the 1994 LRDP EIR. Cumulative noise impacts were reevaluated in the 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR but no changes were made to the 1994 LRDP EIR impacts or mitigation measures (Section 8 of the 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR). The proposed project is within the scope of the analysis presented in the 1994 LRDP EIR for 2005-06 as reevaluated in the 1997-98 SEIR.

The 1994 LRDP EIR identified the following mitigation measure, which is incorporated into the proposed project, to mitigate cumulative noise impacts:

- **LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-4(a)** - The Campus shall evaluate each project proposed under the 1994 LRDP for its potential to create, or contribute to, noise levels which would exceed State of California general plan guidelines on campus, Solano County general plan guidelines within Solano County, Yolo County general plan guidelines within Yolo County, City of Davis general plan guidelines within Davis, or Cal OSHA standards.

- **LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-4(b)** - Implement Mitigation Measure 4.4-3(a) through (c).

- **LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-3(a)** - Prior to final project approval, the Campus shall evaluate each project proposed under the 1994 LRDP for potential exposure to noise levels exceeding 60 $L_{dn}$.

and

- **LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-3(b)** - If individual projects would be exposed to noise levels between 60 $L_{dn}$ and 70 $L_{dn}$, the Campus shall undertake, and implement the recommendations of, a detailed analysis of noise reduction features necessary to achieve an interior noise level of 45 $L_{dn}$. It is anticipated that conventional construction, but with closed windows and fresh air supply systems or air conditioning, would normally achieve the necessary noise attenuation.

or
**LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-3(c)** - If individual projects would be exposed to noise levels in excess of 70 $L_{dn}$, the Campus shall implement one or more of the following noise reduction measures:

(i) install setbacks, sound walls, bergs and/or use noise-attenuating site design to reduce exterior noise levels to less than 60 $L_{dn}$ for residential and/or adjacent residential land uses on Campus;

(ii) install setbacks, sound walls, bergs, and/or noise-attenuating site design to reduce exterior noise levels to less than 70 $L_{dn}$ for academic and administrative land uses and adjacent academic and administrative land uses on Campus; and/or

(iii) employ adequate construction noise attenuation materials or site design for residential areas on Campus so that the interior noise level is 45 $L_{dn}$ or less.

**LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-4(c)**

(i) The Noise Element of the City of Davis General Plan includes land use noise compatibility standards, as depicted in Figure 4.4-3. It is within the jurisdiction of the City of Davis to implement the policies and standards found in the Noise Element.

(ii) The Noise Element of the Yolo County General Plan includes land use noise compatibility standards, as depicted in Figure 4.4-2. It is within the jurisdiction of Yolo County to implement the policies and standards found in the Noise Element.

(iii) The Noise Element of the Solano County General Plan includes land use noise compatibility standards, as depicted in Figure 4.4-4. It is within the jurisdiction of Solano County to implement the policies and standards found in the Noise Element.

Implementation of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-4 would reduce the magnitude of cumulative noise levels; however, the feasibility and/or implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.4-4 cannot be guaranteed by the University of California because it falls within other jurisdictions to enforce and monitor. Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. This cumulative impact was adequately analyzed in the 1994 LRDP EIR and fully addressed by the Findings and Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 1994 LRDP and certification of the 1994 LRDP EIR. No further mitigation beyond that adopted as part of the 1994 LRDP EIR is available to reduce this cumulative impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measures**

4.4-2 None available beyond 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.4-3 and 4.4-4.

**Potential Cumulative Noise Effects through 2014-15**

The campus has prepared a Cumulative Impacts Analysis, presented as Appendix D of this document, that serves to inform the public concerning all that is currently known about the campus’ potential growth through 2014-15. This analysis includes an evaluation of the possible cumulative noise effects of anticipated development through 2014-15.
As discussed in Appendix D, growth through 2014-15 would increase vehicle trips on campus roadways to approximately 8,980 trips per day beyond that projected for 2005-06, which would increase cumulative noise levels. In addition to traffic-generated noise, new campus facilities required to accommodate growth anticipated through 2014-15 (including athletic facilities, building mechanical systems, and other stationary sources) would also increase noise levels.

Continued implementation of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.4-4(a) through (c) would reduce the significance of increased cumulative noise levels attributed to increased vehicle trips and other noise sources through 2014-15. However, 1994 LRDP EIR Impact 4.4-4 would remain significant and unavoidable because the University could not guarantee implementation of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.4-4(c), which is not within the jurisdiction of the University to enforce and monitor. The availability of additional feasible mitigation measures will be investigated as part of the LRDP update process.
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4.5 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Introduction

The proposed project would relocate Environmental Horticulture teaching and research field activities currently located on a portion of the Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management project site to a site in the west campus north of Hutchison Drive near the University Airport (see Figure 3-3). The project would include development of an agricultural support building, a greenhouse, roadway, and a parking area on up to two acres at the relocation site. This section addresses the potential biological effects associated with developing this land, which is potential foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawk, a state-listed threatened species. This loss of potential Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat was not considered in the 1994 LRDP or addresses in the 1994 LRDP EIR. Therefore, the potentially significant impact is discussed in this document. All other impacts related to biological resources are adequately addressed in the Tiered Initial Study prepared for this project (Appendix A). All relevant information, including applicable environmental and regulatory setting, standards of significance, and mitigation measures identified in Section 4.4 of the 1994 LRDP EIR; in Section 4.8 of the WWTP Replacement Project EIR, in Chapter 8 of the 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR, and in Item 10 of the Center for the Arts Performance Hall and South Entry Roadway and Parking Improvements are incorporated by reference and summarized below as appropriate. Please see Amendments to the 1994 LRDP and Revisions to the 1994 LRDP EIR (through November 2001), which is included as Appendix C of this DEIR for further information.

Environmental Setting

The campus is located in a region composed primarily of agricultural lands that include remnant riparian (streamside) and urban areas. Habitat types found on the campus are discussed in the 1994 LRDP EIR on pages 4.7-2 to 4.7-8 and illustrated in Figure 4.7-1 on page 4.7-3. The Environmental Horticulture relocation site is currently agricultural land. This habitat is discussed further below.

Habitat

Agricultural lands include two habitat/cover types: (1) cropland/pasture habitat composed of an annual herbaceous plant species cover type and (2) orchard/vineyard habitat composed of a perennial woody plant species cover type. The proposed site for relocated Environmental Horticulture teaching and research field activities consists of cropland habitat.

Cropland is used for cultivation of annual or short-lived crops. It is a dynamic landscape feature that is frequently altered throughout the year. Most cropland habitat supports a single crop that is planted in the spring and harvested during summer or fall. Planting and harvesting cycles are
usually associated with the discing and tilling of fields which regularly and frequently disturbs the land. Cropland provides food and cover for wildlife species such as song birds and small rodents, and foraging opportunities for raptors due to the frequent flooding, mowing, or harvesting of the fields that make the prey readily available. The state-listed threatened Swainson's hawk relies heavily on cropland for foraging. Plant species associated with cropland habitat include cultivated crops and non-native herbs, shrubs, and trees associated with landscaped or disturbed edges along roads, irrigation ditches, and agricultural fields. Additional habitat elements that contribute to the value of cropland when present are isolated oak trees and tree-lined, vegetated, or landscaped borders of fields and along roads.

**Special-Status Species**

Special-status species such as state and federally listed rare, threatened, or endangered species are discussed in the 1994 LRDP EIR on pages 4.7-8 through 4-7-18. Potential special-status species that might be found on the campus are presented in Tables 4.7-1 and 4.7-2 of the 1994 LRDP EIR. A biological survey of the proposed Environmental Horticulture relocation site was performed in December 2001 (May Consulting). The survey results indicated that: (1) the site has been in active agriculture in the past and does not support suitable habitat for any special status plant species potentially found on the campus; (2) no elderberry shrubs were located on or in the vicinity of the site; (3) no burrowing owls or signs of burrowing owls were observed on the site, and ground squirrel burrows were generally absent, making future presence of active burrowing owl burrows on the site unlikely; (4) no wetlands were present on or near the site; and (5) the site is potential Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat. The development of up to two acres of cropland habitat for Environmental Horticulture support structures would induce the loss of potential Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat.

**Swainson's Hawk**

The Swainson's hawk is a relatively large bird-of-prey that typically nests in large trees in riparian corridors as well as in isolated trees remaining in or adjacent to agricultural fields in the Central Valley. However, in the City of Davis and on the central campus, these hawks also nest in large trees among buildings, roads, and dwellings.

This species forages in open grassland habitats and has adjusted to foraging in certain types of agricultural lands. The value of foraging habitat can be affected by a variety of characteristics including density and availability of prey, proximity to disturbing features, and distance to nesting territories. Published information indicates these raptors typically forage within a 10-mile radius of nest sites, but may range up to 18 miles from a nest site in search of suitable foraging habitat and available prey. Formal studies have shown that Swainson's hawks will spend the majority of foraging time in close proximity to the nest site when high quality foraging habitat (measured by the abundance and availability of prey) is present.

The occurrence of the Swainson's hawk in and around the campus is well documented. Surveys for Swainson's hawk nests on the campus and within one-half mile of the central campus have been conducted annually since 1990. The results of these surveys document over 50 different nest trees on the campus during that period.¹ Most of the Swainson's hawk nests are located in the Putah Creek riparian corridor. Seven Swainson's hawk nest sites used in the last 10 years are
within one-half mile of the proposed relocation site for the Environmental Horticulture teaching and research fields activities. These sites are located within the riparian habitat along the North Fork cutoff to the north and along Putah Creek to the south.

There is one swainson’s hawk nest within one-half mile of the Environmental Horticulture relocation site. The nest is located about 1,600 feet south of the site, and is screened by existing buildings and trees. It is located south of the Hog Barn, about 400 feet from the north end of the University Airport’s runway and about 300 feet from the airport’s taxiway.

**Regulatory Setting**

Please refer to pages 4.4-22 and 4.4-23 of the WWTP Replacement Project DEIR for a discussion of federal and state regulations governing protected species and the protection and conservation of biological resources. The following summarizes regulations applicable to the proposed project.

**Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act**

The Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act is the domestic law that affirms, or implements, the United States' commitment to four international conventions (with Canada, Japan, Mexico, and Russia) for the protection of a shared migratory bird resource. Each of the conventions protects selected species of birds that are common to both countries (i.e., they occur in both countries at some point during their annual life cycle). The Migratory Bird Treaty Act fully protects all migratory birds and their parts (including eggs, nests, and feathers).

**California Endangered Species Act**

The California Endangered Species Act (CESA) pertains to state-listed endangered and threatened plant and wildlife species. CESA requires state agencies to consult with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) when preparing CEQA documents in order to ensure that lead agency actions do not jeopardize listed species. CESA directs agencies to consult with CDFG on projects or actions that could affect listed species, directs CDFG to determine whether jeopardy would occur, and allows CDFG to identify reasonable and prudent alternatives to a project consistent with conserving the species. A lead agency can approve a project that affects a listed species if it is determined that there are overriding considerations for doing so; however, agencies are prohibited from approving projects that would cause the extinction of a listed species.

The Swainson's hawk is listed as a threatened species under the California Endangered Species Act and is also fully protected against take pursuant to Section 3503.5 of the California Fish and Game Code and the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act.
Impacts And Mitigation Measures

Standards of Significance

The relevant standards of significance from the 1994 LRDP EIR considered an impact to biological resources to be significant if campus or regional growth would:

- result in the substantial reduction in acres of habitat (including wetlands) of native fish, wildlife, or plants; or

- be in conflict with existing state or federal natural resource protection laws, policies, or guidelines.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

4.5-1 Development of agricultural support structures at the Environmental Horticulture teaching and research fields relocation site would result in the conversion of approximately two acres of agricultural land-cropland habitat, which would result in the loss of potential foraging habitat for Swainson's hawk and other resident and migratory species. This is considered a significant impact.

The proposed relocation site for Environmental Horticulture teaching and research fields includes potential Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat. Environmental Horticulture teaching and research field activities would keep most of this area as cropland habitat, but less than two acres of the site would be developed for a proposed support/storage building, greenhouse, roadway, and parking area.

The CDFG has determined that the loss of suitable foraging habitat within a 10-mile radius of recorded nest sites constitutes take of the species pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act. Currently, CDFG guidelines require one acre of foraging habitat be preserved for every acre lost. Therefore, prior to mitigation, the loss of potential Swainson's hawk foraging habitat associated with relocation of the Environmental Horticulture teaching and research fields is considered a significant impact.

The 1994 LRDP EIR (as revised upon approval of the WWTP Replacement Project and the 1997-98 Major Capitol Improvement Project) identified that development allowed under the 1994 LRDP, as amended, would contribute to the conversion of 231 acres of agricultural land and the loss of foraging habitat for the Swainson's hawk (Impact 4.7-5). The 1994 LRDP EIR identified the following mitigation measure to reduce significant impacts on Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat to a less-than-significant level:

LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-5 - As Agricultural Land and Ruderal/Annual Grassland habitat is converted to Campus development under the 1994 LRDP EIR, the Campus will compensate for the loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat at a 1:1 ratio of acres lost to acres preserved through the implementation of one or a combination of the following methods.
• Approximately 40 acres of Cropland habitat in the "C" tract adjacent to the Putah Creek Reserve on the West Campus will remain Campus agricultural research uses but will be under land use restrictions that will ensure cropland cover types that are suitable as Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat. No incompatible uses such as orchards, vineyard, or development will be allowed in the areas set aside for Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat. However, normal crop rotations may periodically result in unsuitable cover types of annual crops.

• Approximately 20 acres of land within the North Fork Cutoff that currently support livestock enclosures will be restored to a woodland and grassland habitat. No livestock shall be allowed within the restoration area.

• Approximately 55 acres of existing orchards adjacent to Putah Creek at the Russell Ranch will be removed, converted to a cover type suitable for Swainson's hawk foraging, and added to the Putah Creek Reserve.

• Approximately 85 acres at the Russell Ranch that have been designated as a habitat restoration and research area will include the establishment of cover types that are suitable Swainson's hawk foraging habitat.

The proposed project would result in the conversion of two acres of foraging habitat over that anticipated by the 1994 LRDP. Therefore, even with implementation of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-5, impacts to Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat would remain significant. As a result, additional mitigation is required to reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of the following project-specific mitigation measure would reduce the loss of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat to a less-than-significant level.

4.5-1 Approximately two acres of land designated for support use in the west campus, west of County Road 98 and north of the Campus Landfill, shall be redesignated by The Regents as Teaching and Research Fields.

Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 would provide for 1:1 replacement of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat, consistent with CDFG guidelines, thus reducing the impact to a less-than-significant level. See Figure 4.5-1 for the location of the proposed mitigation site.

Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures

4.5-2 Development allowed under the 1994 LRDP, as amended, would contribute to the regional loss of 1,258 acres of agricultural land habitat for Swainson’s hawk and other resident and migratory wildlife species. This is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

As identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised, development on campus, in the City of Davis, and in other cities in Yolo and Solano counties would result in a cumulative loss of approximately 1,258 acres of agricultural land and annual grassland through 2005-06.
4.5 Biological Resources

Figure 4.5-1
Development of the proposed project would contribute approximately two acres of potential Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat to that assessed in the 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised upon approval of the WWTP Replacement Project and the 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects.

Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 would redesignate two acres of support use to Teaching and Research Fields to compensate for the two acres of potential Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat developed by the project. With implementation of Project Specific Mitigation Measure 4.5-1, the proposed project would contribute the conversion of two acres of foraging habitat to that evaluated in the 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised. The proposed project, in conjunction with cumulative growth under the 1994 LRDP and in the region, would contribute to a cumulative loss of agricultural land habitat. Currently, Yolo County and the cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland are preparing a county-wide habitat management plan for special-status species. UC Davis is participating in this effort in an advisory capacity. The preparation of a regional habitat management plan may ultimately resolve and mitigate the cumulative impacts to special-status species and other wildlife in Yolo County resulting from habitat conversion. However, at the time of this EIR, no such a plan is in place that will ensure the adequate preservation of wildlife habitat in the region to compensate for cumulative impacts.

The 1994 LRDP EIR identified the following mitigation measures to reduce the magnitude of impacts associated with cumulative loss of agricultural land habitat:

**LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-9(a)** - Implement 1994 Mitigation Measures 4.7-1, 4.7-3, 4.7-4, 4.7-5, and 4.7-6.

**LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-9(b)** - The County of Yolo, when implementing the County-wide Habitat Management Plan, should impose a 1:1 mitigation ratio of habitat preserved to that converted on all development projects within their jurisdiction that convert Agricultural Land and Annual Grassland habitat to urban development.

Mitigation measures listed in Mitigation Measure 4.7-9(a) are incorporated as part of the proposed project and have been or are currently being implemented, as discussed in Chapter 8 of the Tiered Initial Study (Appendix A of this DEIR). Of the mitigation measures included in 4.7-9(a), the 1994 LRDP EIR identified Mitigation Measure 4.7-5 to reduce significant impacts resulting from the loss of 231 acres of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat associated with development allowed under the 1994 LRDP.

Implementation of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-9 would reduce the magnitude of habitat loss in Yolo County; however, the feasibility and/or implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7-9 cannot be guaranteed by the University of California because it falls within other jurisdictions to enforce and monitor. Therefore, the impact would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

**Mitigation Measures**

Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce the project’s contribution to habitat loss identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised, but the cumulative impact identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR would be unchanged and would remain significant and unavoidable. This
cumulative impact has adequately analyzed in the 1994 LRDP EIR and fully addressed by the Findings and Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in connection with its approval of the 1994 LRDP and certification of the 1994 LRDP EIR. No further mitigation beyond that adopted as part of the 1994 LRDP EIR and project is available to reduce the magnitude of this cumulative impact.

4.5-2  Implement Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.5-1.

Potential Cumulative Biological Resources Effects through 2014-15

The campus has prepared a Cumulative Impacts Analysis, presented as Appendix D of this document, that serves to inform the public concerning all that is currently known about the campus' potential growth through 2014-15. This analysis includes an evaluation of the possible cumulative biological effects of anticipated development through 2014-15.

As discussed in Appendix D, the campus anticipates that a total of approximately 220 acres could be developed through 2014-15 that were not previously considered in the 1994 LRDP. Although the precise location of this future development is currently unknown, the campus conservatively assumes that this development could occur on Agricultural Land and Ruderal/Annual Grassland habitat. As a result, the cumulative loss of habitat identified in 1994 LRDP EIR Impact 4.7-9 would increase. In addition, 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-5 would be updated in the next LRDP EIR to reflect new mitigation areas that would be used to compensate for the loss of Agricultural Land and Ruderal/Annual Grassland habitat. Because locations of land uses (including mitigation areas) will be decided during the LRDP update process, it would be too speculative to assume future mitigation areas at this time. Implementation of this updated measure, as well as continued implementation of the other portions of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measures 4.7-9 (a) and (b), would reduce the cumulative impact associated with conversion of Agricultural Land and Ruderal/Annual Grassland habitat through 2014-15. However, 1994 LRDP EIR Impact 4.7-9 would remain significant and unavoidable because the University could not guarantee the feasibility and/or implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7-9(b), which falls within other jurisdictions to enforce and monitor. The availability of additional feasible mitigation measures will be investigated during the LRDP update process.
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5.1 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

Introduction

As required by CEQA, an EIR must discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing in the vicinity of the project and how that growth will, in turn, affect the surrounding environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126[g]). Growth can be induced in a number of ways, including by eliminating obstacles to growth and stimulating economic activity outside of the project. In the case of the proposed project, the growth inducement could potentially relate to infrastructure and utilities improvements and whether those improvements would allow removal of infrastructure limitations and the economic benefits to downtown Davis businesses and whether this would contribute to growth in the city. These potential growth inducements are discussed below.

Under CEQA, induced growth is not considered necessarily detrimental or beneficial. Induced growth is considered a significant impact only if it directly or indirectly affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public services, or if it can be demonstrated that the potential growth could, in some other way, significantly affect the environment.

The relationship of the proposed project to the 1994 LRDP population projections and the potential of the project could indirectly stimulate growth by the provision of improved infrastructure are discussed below.

1994 LRDP Population Projections

The 1994 LRDP DEIR (pages 3-2 and 3-3) states the following regarding campus population projections:

Population projections for all campuses in the UC system are established in a process that is determined by State statute and policy. The specific campus population projections for UC Davis are determined by the campus and the Office of the President, which consider:

- the responsibility of the University as required by the State Master Plan for Higher Education to accommodate the top 12.5 percent of graduating high school students in the University of California system;
- the state's ability to support financially this policy commitment;
- population growth and specifically the number of qualified students; and
- the academic plan and physical capacity of the Davis campus to accommodate students.
Anticipated population growth under the 1994 LRDP is summarized in Table 5.1-1. The on-campus population anticipated under the 1994 LRDP for 2005-06 is 38,630 (26,000 students and 12,630 faculty and staff). As shown in Table 5.1-1, the 1999-2000 on-campus population estimate was 32,775 (22,887 students and 9,888 faculty and staff). Recently built and approved projects as of December 2001 would bring the population to approximately 34,468 (23,605 students and 10,863 staff). The proposed project would contribute approximately 375 new campus employees. The project would not contribute new students. Population growth associated with the proposed project would not exceed population projections assumed in the 1994 LRDP and analyzed in the 1994 LRDP EIR. The proposed project and other projects currently under consideration (the Veterinary Medicine Instructional Facility) would add approximately 380 new campus employees and 568 new students to this total. The total (35,416) would also not exceed the on-campus population anticipated under the 1994 LRDP. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with 1994 LRDP population projections.

**TABLE 5.1-1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students⁴</td>
<td>21,060</td>
<td>22,887</td>
<td>+ 3,113</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff²</td>
<td>9,550</td>
<td>9,888</td>
<td>+ 2,742</td>
<td>12,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>30,610</td>
<td>32,775</td>
<td>+ 5,855</td>
<td>38,630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ Off-campus student population not counted in this total. Approximately 570 students are located at the UC Davis Medical Complex, Sacramento campus, and an additional 280 students are enrolled elsewhere at other UC Davis affiliated facilities. Therefore, accounting for the off-campus student population, total UC Davis enrollment in 2005-06 will be 26,850.

² Includes faculty and staff located on the central, west, and south campus units, Russell Ranch, and at campus facilities in the City of Davis sphere of influence.

³ Base year for 1994 LRDP EIR analysis. Source: UC Davis 1994 LRDP EIR.

⁵ Source: UC Davis 2001.

Stimulation of Population Growth Within the City of Davis

The 1994 LRDP guides growth on the UC Davis campus through 2005-06. Growth in the urban area adjacent to the campus is under the jurisdiction of the City of Davis and is guided by the City of Davis General Plan. The City of Davis General Plan is designed to accommodate ultimate urban development within the Davis Planning Area, including the UC Davis Campus and the unincorporated areas of Yolo and Solano County in the City's sphere of influence. The 1987 City of Davis General Plan projected a resident population in the City of Davis planning area to reach 75,000 people by 2010. This population projection was judged sufficient to accommodate the internal growth needs of the Davis Planning Area, including UC Davis expansion contemplated at that time. The growth rate for the City, from 1987 to 2010, was projected at 1.8 percent per year, with much of the City's projected growth and rate of development attributable to campus growth. In May 2001, the City of Davis adopted an update to the 1987 General Plan; however, the population projection of 75,000 for the City of Davis area by 2010 remains unchanged.¹ Campus enrollment identified in the 2001 Update to the City General Plan was assumed to reach a total campus student population of 26,000 by 2010,
unchanged from previous assumptions. The 1994 LRDP indicates growth in student enrollment to a total of 26,000 through 2005-06. This is consistent with the projections of student enrollment growth put forth in the City of Davis General Plan. Please see Appendix D for an analysis of cumulative impacts given the campus’s currently projected growth through 2014-15.

There is the potential that the proposed project could benefit downtown businesses, which could contribute to growth in the downtown area. Increased visitors could generate additional business for downtown lodging facilities, restaurants, and commercial businesses. However, it is not expected that the proposed project would generate substantial new jobs in the City of Davis beyond that growth previously addressed in the 1994 LRDP EIR. Impacts associated with potential increases in enrollment through 2014-15 beyond that approved in the 1994 LRDP and evaluated in the 1994 LRDP EIR are discussed in Appendix D of this DEIR.

**Proposed Infrastructure Improvements**

As discussed in Item 3b of the Tiered Initial Study, the proposed utility infrastructure improvements needed to adequately serve the proposed project would be designed to meet needs of only the proposed project, and no growth-inducing impacts would occur beyond those analyzed in the 1994 LRDP EIR.

**Summary of Growth-Inducing Impacts**

Although improvements to infrastructure and increases in population growth would occur as part of the proposed project, the infrastructure improvements would be sized to accommodate only the proposed project. Population growth would not exceed that approved under the 1994 LRDP. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce growth beyond that which was assumed by the campus in the 1994 LRDP for 2005-06 and fully evaluated in the 1994 LRDP EIR.
5.1 Growth-Inducing Impacts
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5.2 IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR must address any significant irreversible environmental changes that would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.2(c)). An impact would fall into this category if:

- the project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources;
- the primary and secondary impacts of a project would generally commit future generations to similar uses (e.g., a highway provides access to a previously remote area);
- the project involves uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents associated with the project; or
- the phasing of the proposed consumption of resources is not justified (e.g., the project involves the wasteful use of energy).

Determining whether the proposed project would result in significant irreversible effects requires a determination of whether key resources would be degraded or destroyed with little possibility of restoration.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in an irreversible commitment of energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels, including fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline for automobiles and construction equipment. The consumption of other non-renewable and slowly-renewable resources would also result during construction and operation of the proposed development. These resources include, but are not limited to: lumber, sand and gravel, asphalt, metals, water, etc. An increased commitment of public services would also result from project implementation such as domestic and utility water, wastewater, storm drainage, electricity and natural gas, and telecommunication services. Irretrievable commitments of the above-named resources are considered justified to achieve the overall goals and objectives of the proposed project as discussed Chapter 3, Project Description.
5.3 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

An EIR must include a description of those impacts identified as significant and unavoidable should the proposed action be implemented (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b) and Public Resources Code 21000(b)). For the impacts listed below, either no mitigation or only partial mitigation is feasible. Therefore, these impacts are considered significant and unavoidable. In addition, it should be noted that some of the following impacts have been identified as significant and unavoidable because the impacts are regional in nature and are related to growth and development throughout the City of Davis and Yolo and Solano Counties. Potential mitigation measures for these regional impacts are identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR as well as this EIR; however, the feasibility and/or implementation of these mitigation measures is outside the control of The Regents and cannot be guaranteed by The Regents because they fall within other jurisdictions to enforce and monitor. For this reason, the University must consider the impacts significant and unavoidable.

Significant and unavoidable impacts that were determined to be fully addressed in the Initial Study and did not require further evaluation in this DEIR include: construction air pollutants (Item 6b); criteria air emissions (Item 6b, c); toxic air emissions (Item 6b, c, d); use and disposal of hazardous materials (Item 7a, b); development on potentially contaminated sites (Item 7d); demand for emergency response (Item 7g); receiving water quality (Item 9a); groundwater recharge (Item 9b); demand for water from the deep aquifer (Item 9b); seismic effects (Item 10a); loss of cultural resources (Item 12b, d); loss of rural character (Item 13b, d); City of Davis fire protection services (Item 14a(i)); City of Davis police protection services (Item 14 a(ii)); and contribution of school-age students in the Davis Joint Unified School District (Item 14 a(iii)). Please refer to Appendix A, Initial Study, for further information regarding these significant and unavoidable impacts.

Potential significant and unavoidable environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed project and are analyzed in this DEIR are summarized in Table 2-1 of this DEIR and are summarized below.

Transportation and Circulation

4.3-1 Increases in traffic volumes associated with the proposed project in relationship to the capacity of the future transportation network would contribute to LOS exceedances.

4.3-3 Cumulative increases in traffic volumes under non-event conditions in relationship to the capacity of the future transportation network would result in LOS exceedances.
4.3-4 Cumulative increases in traffic volumes under event conditions in relationship to the capacity of the future transportation network would result in LOS exceedances.

**Noise**

4.4-2 Development allowed under the 1994 LRDP, in conjunction with the proposed project, and cumulative development in the Davis area, would result in increased traffic and other noise sources that could expose people and structures on- and off-campus to significant cumulative noise levels.

**Biological Resources**

4.5-2 Development allowed under the 1994 LRDP, as amended, would contribute to the regional loss of 1,258 acres of agricultural land habitat for Swainson’s hawk and other resident and migratory wildlife species.
6. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Introduction

The primary intent of the alternatives evaluation in an EIR, as stated in Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, is to “describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” Further, the Guidelines state that “the discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives capable of eliminating any significant adverse environmental effects or reducing them to a level of insignificance, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.” The feasibility of an alternative may be determined based on a variety of factors including, but not limited to, site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and site accessibility and control (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1)).

This chapter includes a discussion of proposed project objectives, alternatives considered but rejected from further analysis, and an evaluation of alternatives to the proposed project. The discussion of the environmentally superior alternative is provided at the end of this chapter.

Objectives of the Proposed Project

The choice of alternatives is guided primarily by feasibility and the need both to reduce or eliminate project impacts and to achieve project objectives. The objectives of the project were used to identify appropriate alternatives. As stated in Chapter 3, Project Description, the campus identified the following objectives for the proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building Project:

- provide a venue for state, national, and international academic conferences on the campus;
- provide an opportunity to host visitors, alumni, and the business community;
- add to UC Davis’ role as a regional academic and arts center and meeting place in combination with the adjacent Center for the Arts Performance Hall (currently under construction) and Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center;
- ensure that the conference center and hotel are financially viable operations;
- provide adequate space for growth of the Graduate School of Management;
 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

• provide access and exposure to the broader community for the conference center, hotel, and the Graduate School of Management;

• provide space for future growth and consolidation of office space for a major portion of the Office of University Relations;

• consolidate Office of University Relations operations at a site that facilitates easy access by faculty, other campus groups, and external constituencies; and

• provide outdoor gathering areas and landscaped pedestrian walkways that link to adjacent uses including the Center for the Arts Performance Hall and the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center.

Alternatives Considered and Eliminated From Further Analysis

Section 15126.6(f) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any identified significant impacts of the project. Of those alternatives, CEQA requires that an EIR only examine in detail the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project. As previously stated, the feasibility of an alternative may be determined based on a variety of factors including, but not limited to, site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and site accessibility and control. CEQA Section 15126.6(f)(3) also states that an EIR need not consider an alternative whose effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative. Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration if they fail to meet most of the project objectives, if they would not avoid significant environmental impacts, and/or if they are determined to be infeasible.

Several alternatives were considered but rejected from further analysis because they could not feasibly attain most of the project’s objectives, would not reduce or avoid significant environmental impacts, or were determined to be infeasible. Alternatives considered but rejected from further analysis include the following:

• conference center and hotel on East Olive Drive in the City of Davis;
• conference center without a hotel on the Railroad Triangle (property adjacent to the UPRR station bordered by the railroad tracks) in the City of Davis;
• reduced-size conference center without a hotel in the parking lot area south of First Street across from the Hallmark Inn on campus property in the City of Davis;
• reduced size conference center without a hotel on the site of the former City of Davis police station site on F Street between Second and Third Streets; and a
• conference center and hotel on the Nishi triangle property south of the campus (bordered by the UPRR tracks to the north and I-80 to the south).
None of these alternatives (with or without the hotel) would achieve most of the objectives of the proposed project. Most importantly, a conference center and hotel located off the campus would fundamentally change the nature of the project, whose dominant objectives are to host conferences on campus, to create an on-campus interface between campus constituencies and off-campus conference attendees and to provide access and exposure to the campus for the broader community. In addition, an off-campus location would not provide the opportunity for co-location of complementary facilities such as the adjacent Center for the Performing Arts and Buehler and Alumni Visitors Center. Therefore, these alternatives would not achieve the objectives of the South Entry Area and would not contribute to the campus’ role as a regional academic and arts center and meeting place.

In addition, the University would need to purchase or lease any site not currently owned by the campus (including all of the alternatives listed above but the one in the parking area south of First Street) that would affect the financial feasibility of the project. Because the project relies on revenue generated by the hotel to make the entire project possible, the alternatives that do not include a hotel (i.e., the Railroad Triangle site, the parking lot to the south of First Street site, and the F Street between Second and Third Streets site) would not be financially viable. Furthermore, site improvements including infrastructure modifications, and circulation and parking improvements that would be required at off-campus locations would cause additional financial strain on the project, making it less financially feasible.

In addition to their inability to meet project objectives and financial infeasibility, these alternatives were rejected from further analysis because they would not avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts. These impacts are summarized below.

**Conference Center and Hotel on East Olive Drive in the City of Davis -** The Gateway/Olive Drive Specific Plan provides for a variety of land uses along East Olive Drive, including Commercial Service, Residential High Density and Medium Density, and Multiple Use. Development of a conference center facility at this location could result in potential land use incompatibilities with adjacent future uses. A conference center facility on East Olive Drive would also substantially increase traffic at the intersection of Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, which already operates at LOS “F”. This alternative location currently has limited parking; therefore, roadway and parking infrastructure would need to be planned, approved and constructed to accommodate a conference center facility.

**Conference Center Without a Hotel on the Railroad Triangle in the City of Davis -** The Railroad Triangle property is designated for Public and Semi-Public land uses in the Davis Core Area Specific plan. Development of a conference center facility at this location would be inconsistent with the adopted Specific Plan land use and; therefore, inconsistent with the City of Davis General Plan. This site would be less environmentally suitable because it is in close proximity to the UPRR tracks. Design features that would be necessary to reduce interior noise to acceptable levels for a conference center facility may not be feasible or achievable at a reasonable cost. The Railroad Triangle property currently has no access and limited parking; therefore, major roadway and parking infrastructure would need to be planned, approved, and constructed to accommodate a conference center facility. Primary access to the site would be through the Richards Boulevard undercrossing, which would direct conference attendees arriving from off-campus through several intersections that currently operate at LOS “E” or “F”.
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Reduced-Size Conference Center Without a Hotel in the Parking Lot Area South of First Street Across from the Hallmark Inn on Campus Property in the City of Davis - The site south of First Street across from the Hallmark Inn at F Street would be subject to greater noise effects from rail traffic on the adjacent UPRR tracks. Design features that would be necessary to reduce interior noise to acceptable levels for a conference center facility may not be feasible or achievable at a reasonable cost. Primary access to the site would be through the Richards Boulevard undercrossing, which would direct conference attendees arriving from off-campus through several intersections that currently operate at LOS “E” or “F”. In addition, the project would be constructed on an existing parking lot which would result in greater parking impacts in the downtown due to a reduction in the available parking supply.

Reduced Size Conference Center Without a Hotel on the Site of the Former City of Davis Police Station Site on F Street Between Second and Third Streets - The site of the former City of Davis Police Station is approximately two acres, which is well below the amount of land needed to accommodate the facility and required setbacks. Additionally, the former police station site is currently designated as Retail Stores in the Davis Core Area Specific Plan and development of a conference center facility at that location would be inconsistent with this land use. This alternative could also reduce the opportunity for retail development, which would be inconsistent with current City General Plan policies that encourage retail development in the downtown area. Primary access to the site would be through the Richards Boulevard undercrossing, which would direct conference attendees arriving from off-campus through several intersections that currently operate at LOS “E” or “F”. This alternative location currently has only street parking and limited parking lot capacity near by; therefore, roadway and parking infrastructure would need to be planned, approved and constructed to accommodate a conference center facility.

Conference Center and Hotel on the Nishi Triangle Property South of the Campus in the City of Davis - The Nishi triangle property south of the UPRR rail line is designated Urban Reserve in the City of Davis General Plan. This land could remain in agriculture or could eventually be developed for university-related uses. Development of this site would result in a conversion of agricultural land to urban uses that would also contribute to a loss of biological resources. This site would also be less environmentally suitable because it is bordered by both the UPRR tracks and I-80, and as a result would be subject to increased noise levels. Design features that would be necessary to reduce interior noise levels to acceptable standards may not be feasible or achievable at a reasonable cost. There is also no current access to this site and no parking facilities; therefore, major roadway and parking infrastructure would need to be planned, approved and constructed to accommodate a conference center facility and hotel at this location.

Alternatives Analysis

The discussion below provides analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project, including construction and operation of the following alternatives (see Figure 6-1):

- no project-no development;
6. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Figure 6-1
6. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

- no project-expected development (development consistent with 1994 LRDP land use designations);
- conference center and the Graduate School of Management Building without a hotel and restaurant (on the same site as the proposed project);
- conference center with a reduced size (50 rooms) hotel and restaurant and the Graduate School of Management Building (on the same site as the proposed project);
- conference center, hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building in the south campus enterprise reserve;
- conference center, hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building west of the South Entry Parking Structure;
- conference center, hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building on land southwest of the intersection of Hutchison Drive and La Rue Road in the central campus designated as PE/ICA/Recreation in the 1994 LRDP;
- conference center and hotel on Parking Lot 10 at the intersection of First and A Streets with the Graduate School of Management at the proposed project site; and
- conference center and hotel facilities at Russell Boulevard and A Street with the Graduate School of Management at the proposed project site.

This analysis is intended to assist The Regents in their assessment of the proposed project by analyzing the potential environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the alternatives, and comparing these potential impacts of the proposed project. Table 6-1 contains a summary comparison of impacts addressed in this DEIR for both the proposed project and evaluated alternatives. The table provides levels of significance assumed prior to implementation of project-specific mitigation measures and applicable 1994 LRDP EIR mitigation measures (see Table 2-1 in Chapter 2, Summary).

A few of the alternatives analyzed below locate the conference center and hotel at a different site than the proposed project, but leave the Graduate School of Management Building on the proposed site. In these alternatives, it is assumed that the Graduate School of Management Building would be built at the currently proposed location within the proposed site, and therefore existing Environmental Horticulture teaching and research field activities would need to be relocated. The Graduate School of Management location would remain the same because location of the building adjacent to the South Entry Quad (the other available space on the site) would not be consistent with the regional nature of this area. The South Entry Quad area is currently surrounded by the new Center for the Performing Arts (currently under construction) to the west, the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center to the north, and the campus is studying the concept of constructing a Center for the Visual Arts to the south. In addition, the existing Environmental Horticulture teaching and research field activities would most likely be relocated at some time even if no parts of the project were constructed on the site. This is because the entire site is likely to be developed in the future as it is designated for high density academic and administrative uses with potential enterprise opportunity in the 1994 LRDP, as revised.
### TABLE 6-1

**SUMMARY EVALUATION OF CONFERENCE CENTER, HOTEL, AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT BUILDING ALTERNATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Proposed Project(^1)</th>
<th>No Project – No Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Project – Expected Development Alternative</th>
<th>Conference Center without Hotel and Restaurant Facilities</th>
<th>Conference Center with Reduced Size Hotel</th>
<th>South Campus Site Alternative</th>
<th>West of the South Entry Parking Structure Site Alternative</th>
<th>Hutchinson Drive and La Rue Road Site Alternative</th>
<th>First and A Streets Site Alternative</th>
<th>Russell Boulevard and A Street Site Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2–1</td>
<td>Operation of the proposed project would increase the lodging supply in the City of Davis. This increase would not cause physical deterioration in the City of Davis due to the closure of existing lodging facilities.</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2–2</td>
<td>Operation of the proposed project would not conflict with the City of Davis General Plan land use policies and related economic and business development policies.</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Standard of significance before mitigation

SU=Significant and Unavoidable

NI=No Impact

LS=Less-than-Significant

S=Significant

- = Reduced in magnitude

+ = Greater in magnitude
### TABLE 6-1

**SUMMARY EVALUATION OF CONFERENCE CENTER, HOTEL, AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT BUILDING ALTERNATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Proposed Project&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>No Project – No Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Project – Expected Development Alternative</th>
<th>Conference Center without Hotel and Restaurant Facilities</th>
<th>Conference Center with Reduced Size Hotel</th>
<th>South Campus Site Alternative</th>
<th>West of the South Entry Structure Site Alternative</th>
<th>Hutchinson Drive and La Rue Road Site Alternative</th>
<th>First and A Streets Site Alternative</th>
<th>Russell Boulevard and A Street Site Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3–1 Increases in traffic volumes associated with the proposed project in relationship to the capacity of the future transportation network would result in LOS exceedances.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>–SU</td>
<td>–SU</td>
<td>–SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>–SU</td>
<td>–SU</td>
<td>–SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3–2 Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increased demand for parking on campus.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>–LS</td>
<td>–LS</td>
<td>–LS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3–3 Cumulative increases in traffic volumes under non-event conditions in relationship to the capacity of the future transportation network would result in LOS exceedances.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>–SU</td>
<td>–SU</td>
<td>–SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>–SU</td>
<td>–SU</td>
<td>–SU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>1</sup> Standard of significance before mitigation

NI=No Impact  
SU=Significant and Unavoidable  
LS=Less-than-Significant  
S=significant

- = Reduced in magnitude  
+ = Greater in magnitude
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SUMMARY EVALUATION OF CONFERENCE CENTER, HOTEL, AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT BUILDING ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Proposed Project&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>No Project – No Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Project – Expected Development Alternative</th>
<th>Conference Center without Hotel and Restaurant Facilities</th>
<th>Conference Center with Reduced Size Hotel</th>
<th>South Campus Site Alternative</th>
<th>West of the South Entry Structure Site Alternative</th>
<th>Hutchinson Drive and La Rue Road Site Alternative</th>
<th>First and A Streets Site Alternative</th>
<th>Russell Boulevard and A Street Site Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3-4</td>
<td>Cumulative increases in traffic volumes under event conditions in relationship to the capacity of the future transportation network could result in LOS exceedances.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>-SU</td>
<td>-SU</td>
<td>-SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>-SU</td>
<td>-SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4–1</td>
<td>Motor vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would contribute to increased noise levels.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>-LS</td>
<td>-LS</td>
<td>-LS</td>
<td>-LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>-LS</td>
<td>-LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Standard of significance before mitigation
SU=Significant and Unavoidable
NI=No Impact
LS=Less-than-Significant
S=Significant
- = Reduced in magnitude
+ = Greater in magnitude
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**SUMMARY EVALUATION OF CONFERENCE CENTER, HOTEL, AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT BUILDING ALTERNATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Proposed Project¹</th>
<th>No Project – No Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Project – Expected Development Alternative</th>
<th>Conference Center without Hotel and Restaurant Facilities</th>
<th>Conference Center with Reduced Size Hotel</th>
<th>South Campus Site Alternative</th>
<th>West of the South Entry Parking Structure Site Alternative</th>
<th>Hutchinson Drive and La Rue Road Site Alternative</th>
<th>First and A Streets Site Alternative</th>
<th>Russell Boulevard and A Street Site Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Development allowed under the 1994 LRDP, in conjunction with the proposed project, and cumulative development in the Davis area, would result in increased traffic and other noise sources that could expose people and structures on- and off-campus to significant cumulative noise levels.

¹ Standard of significance before mitigation  
NI=No Impact  
SU=Significant and Unavoidable  
- = Reduced in magnitude  
LS=Less-than-Significant  
+ = Greater in magnitude  
S=Significant
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#### SUMMARY EVALUATION OF CONFERENCE CENTER, HOTEL, AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT BUILDING ALTERNATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Proposed Project</th>
<th>No Project – No Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Project – Expected Development Alternative</th>
<th>Conference Center without Hotel and Restaurant Facilities</th>
<th>Conference Center with Reduced Size Hotel</th>
<th>South Campus Site Alternative</th>
<th>West of the South Entry Structure Site Alternative</th>
<th>Hutchinson Drive and La Rue Road Site Alternative</th>
<th>First and A Streets Site Alternative</th>
<th>Russell Boulevard and A Street Site Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5–1  Development of agricultural support structures at the Environmental Horticulture teaching and research fields relocation site would result in the conversion of approximately two acres of agricultural land—cropland habitat, which would result in the loss of potential foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawk and other resident and migratory species.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Standard of significance before mitigation
SU=Significant and Unavoidable
NI=No Impact
- = Reduced in magnitude
LS=Less-than-Significant
+ = Greater in magnitude
S=Significant
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**SUMMARY EVALUATION OF CONFERENCE CENTER, HOTEL, AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT BUILDING ALTERNATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Proposed Project¹</th>
<th>No Project – No Development Alternative</th>
<th>No Project – Expected Development Alternative</th>
<th>Conference Center without Hotel and Restaurant Facilities</th>
<th>Conference Center with Reduced Size Hotel</th>
<th>South Campus Site Alternative</th>
<th>West of the South Entry Parking Structure Site Alternative</th>
<th>Hutchinson Drive and La Rue Road Site Alternative</th>
<th>First and A Streets Site Alternative</th>
<th>Russell Boulevard and A Street Site Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5–2 Development allowed under the 1994 LRDP, as amended, would contribute to the regional loss of 1,258 acres of agricultural land habitat for Swainson’s hawk and other resident and migratory wildlife species.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Standard of significance before mitigation

SU=Significant and Unavoidable

NI=No Impact

LS=Less-than-Significant

S=Significant

- = Reduced in magnitude

+ = Greater in magnitude
No Project-No Development Alternative

The proposed project site and the Environmental Horticulture relocation site would remain in their current condition, and development and operation of the conference center, hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building would not occur. The Department of Environmental Horticulture teaching and research fields would not be relocated.

Land Use and Planning

The project site would remain undeveloped, and there would be no change in campus land use or introduction of new urban uses adjacent to developed campus properties. Like the proposed project, there would be no contribution to any physical deterioration in the City, and no conflict with City of Davis General Plan land use and related economic and business development policies.

Transportation and Circulation

Transportation and Circulation impacts of the proposed project would not occur under the No Project-No Development Alternative. The site would remain undeveloped, and there would be no increase in the campus employee population or guests to the campus. Therefore, there would be no increase in traffic volumes. In addition, there would be no increased demand for parking on campus. Because there would be no development on the site, the No Project-No Development Alternative would not contribute to cumulative increases in traffic volumes.

Noise

Noise impacts of the proposed project would not occur under the No Project-No Development Alternative. The site would remain undeveloped, and there would be no increase in the campus employee population or guests to the campus and no associated increase in traffic-generated noise. Therefore, implementation of the No Project-No Development Alternative would not contribute to project-specific or cumulative traffic noise exposure.

Biological Resources

Biological impacts of the proposed project would not occur under the No Project-No Development Alternative because the Environmental Horticulture teaching and research fields would not be relocated. Therefore, there would be no conversion of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat.

Relationship to Project Objectives

The No Project-No Development Alternative would not achieve any of the objectives for the proposed project.
No Project – Expected Development Alternative

This alternative assumes the conference center, hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building would not be developed. The project site would be developed for a different project consistent with the sites’ 1994 LRDP land use designations of High Density Academic and Administrative – Potential Enterprise Opportunity and Parking. Uses under the High Density Academic and Administrative – Potential Enterprise Opportunity designation could include office space or research laboratories and research support areas that would primarily be financed in cooperation with public or private organizations external to the campus and would support the academic mission of the campus. No conference center and/or hotel uses would be developed. The level of development on the site is assumed would be comparable to the proposed project (approximately 110,000 asf and approximately 375 new employees). The Department of Environmental Horticulture teaching and research fields would be relocated to the west campus, north of Hutchison Drive near the University Airport to accommodate development of the site.

Land Use and Planning

Under the No Project – Expected Development Alternative, the project site would be developed with uses that are consistent with the site’s 1994 LRDP land use designations of High Density Academic and Administrative - Potential Enterprise Opportunity and Parking. The No Project – Expected Development Alternative would not include the construction and operation of a hotel facility; therefore, similar to the proposed project there would be no contribution to any physical deterioration in the City, and no conflict with City of Davis General Plan land use and related economic and business development policies.

Transportation and Circulation

Under the No Project – Expected Development Alternative, the project site is assumed be developed with uses similar to those that exist on the central campus and development would be consistent with current 1994 LRDP land use designations. However, under this alternative, event conditions associated with conference facilities would not occur. Development of this alternative is assumed to result in an increase in the campus employee population similar to the proposed project (approximately 375 new campus employees). Therefore, this alternative would result in an approximately three percent increase in traffic volumes. The proposed alternative would contribute to project-specific and cumulative non-event significant and unavoidable traffic impacts related to intersection LOS exceedances. Because events would not occur associated with the conference center, there would be no contribution to increases in LOS attributed to event conditions.

It is anticipated that the No Project – Expected Development Alternative would include surface parking spaces on-site to serve proposed uses. Similar to the proposed project, additional parking would be available in existing parking facilities, including 885 surface parking spaces in Parking Lots 1 and 2 and 716 spaces in the South Entry Parking Structure. This alternative would result in fewer vehicle trips than that anticipated with the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, adequate parking would be available and this impact is less than significant;
however, the impact for this alternative would be reduced in magnitude compared to the
proposed project because there would be no event conditions.

**Noise**

Implementation of the No Project – Expected Development Alternative would result in the
construction of buildings on the same project site as the proposed project and is assumed to add
the same number of employees to the campus as the proposed project. Because events would not
occur associated with the conference center, increases in traffic attributed to the event conditions
of the proposed project would not occur. Because the increased traffic volumes would be similar
to the proposed project under non-event conditions, traffic volumes associated with this
alternative are assumed to increase only approximately three percent (see Impact 4.4-1). Therefore,
because traffic volumes would not be doubled, No Project – Expected Development
Alternative traffic-related noise levels would not increase by three dBA or more when compared
to existing conditions, and similar to the proposed project, this would be a less-than-significant
impact. However, it would be reduced in magnitude because under this alternative, traffic
volumes and the associated noise levels under proposed project event conditions would not
occur. The cumulative increase in traffic noise sources would be similar to the proposed project
under non-event conditions and would still contribute to cumulative significant and unavoidable
impacts; however, noise impacts for this alternative would be reduced in magnitude from those
associated with the proposed project under event conditions.

**Biological Resources**

Under the No Project – Expected Development Alternative, the project site would be developed
consistent with the 1994 LRDP amended designation for the site, High Density Academic and
Administrative – Potential Enterprise Opportunity. As with the proposed project, development
of the site with more intensive land uses would require the relocation of Environmental
Horticulture teaching and research field activities currently located on the site. Relocation of
these activities would result in the conversion of approximately two additional acres of
Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat over that which currently exists. Identical to the proposed
project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 (which requires
approximately two acres of support use in the west campus be redesignated to Teaching and
Research Fields) would reduce this project-specific impact to a less-than-significant level.
Identical to the proposed project, the cumulative conversion of Agricultural Land and Annual
Grassland habitat to cumulative uses would remain the same as identified in the 1994 LRDP
EIR, as revised. This cumulative conversion is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

**Relationship to Project Objectives**

Depending on what use is constructed, this alternative could achieve some of the objectives
related to consolidation of the Office of University Relations and space for future growth for
both the Office of University Relations and Graduate School of Management. However, this
alternative would not provide a venue for conferences or an opportunity to add to the campus’
role as a regional academic and arts center and meeting place.
Conference Center without Hotel and Restaurant Facilities

This alternative assumes the proposed conference center would be developed on the proposed project site without the proposed hotel and restaurant (restaurant and pub) facilities. Although the project under this alternative would not be financially feasible without the revenue generated by the proposed hotel (as discussed further in the discussion on the need for the hotel in Chapter 3, Project Description), this alternative is analyzed to provide a basis for analyzing effects of a smaller scale project. Under this alternative, the proposed conference center would be approximately 51,000 asf. Identical to the proposed project, the conference center building and the Graduate School of Management Building would be constructed and operated consistent with the proposed project. The Department of Environmental Horticulture teaching and research fields would be relocated to the west campus, north of Hutchison Drive near the University Airport.

Land Use and Planning

Under this alternative, the conference center would be developed at the proposed project site. The Conference Center without Hotel and Restaurant Facilities Alternative would not include the construction and operation of a hotel facility, but it would result in the development of a conference center on campus. Like the proposed project, there would be no contribution to any physical deterioration in the City, and no conflict with City of Davis General Plan land use and related economic and business development policies.

Transportation and Circulation

Implementation of this alternative would result in similar increases in traffic volumes when compared to the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would result in an approximately three percent increase in traffic under non-event conditions. However, these volumes would be reduced in magnitude because there would be no trips attributed to the hotel and restaurant facilities. Impacts under event conditions would also be similar to those of the proposed project. Under event conditions, increases in traffic volumes would be expected to increase by 10 to 16 percent when compared to existing conditions. Under non-event conditions, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would contribute traffic to intersections in the City of Davis that currently operate at an unacceptable LOS under existing conditions: Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, and Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive.

Under event conditions, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would contribute traffic to the two previously mentioned intersections that operate at an unacceptable LOS, and increases in traffic volumes resulting from event condition 2 would reduce the LOS at California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to an unacceptable level. However, impacts under non-event and event conditions would be reduced in magnitude because there would be no trips associated with the hotel and restaurant facilities. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(a) (which requires the implementation of manual traffic controls) would reduce the magnitude of the significant impact at California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level for this alternative. Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) would reduce the magnitude of this impact for the
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intersection of Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, but it is outside the jurisdiction of the University to implement. No feasible improvements exist for the intersection of Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The cumulative increase in traffic would be similar to the proposed project under both non-event and event conditions. Under non-event conditions, this alternative would contribute traffic to the exceedances of 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance at the intersections of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road, Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramp, and Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive. However, impacts under non-event conditions would be reduced in magnitude because there would be no trips associated with the hotel and restaurant facilities. Implementation of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would reduce the magnitude of this impact, but implementation of improvements at some intersections are not in the jurisdiction of the University to implement and monitor.

Under cumulative event conditions, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would contribute traffic that would not result in exceedances of 1994 standards of significance at the intersections of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road (with mitigation), Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramps (with mitigation), and Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road (event condition 2). 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance would continue to be exceeded at the intersections of Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramp, and Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive. However, impacts under event conditions would be reduced in magnitude because there would be no trips associated with the hotel and restaurant facilities. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(a) (which requires the implementation of manual traffic controls) would reduce the magnitude of the significant impact at the intersections of Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramps and Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level for this alternative. Implementation of Project Specific Mitigation Measures 4.3-1(a) and (b) would reduce the impact at the intersection of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(b) would reduce the magnitude of this impact at intersections in the City, but this impact would remain significant and unavoidable because portions of this measure are outside the jurisdiction of the University to implement.

The Conference Center without Hotel and Restaurant Facilities Alternative would include surface parking spaces on-site to serve guests of the building’s proposed uses. Similar to the proposed project, additional parking would be available in existing parking facilities, including 885 surface parking spaces in Parking Lots 1 and 2 and 716 spaces in the South Entry Parking Structure. In addition, an additional 536 spaces could be made available with the use of stacked parking. This alternative would result in somewhat fewer vehicle trips than the proposed project. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, adequate parking would be available and this impact would be less than significant; however, it would be reduced in magnitude.
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Noise

The Conference Center without the Hotel and Restaurant Facilities Alternative would result in generally similar increases in vehicle trip volumes when compared to the proposed project, with slightly fewer vehicle trips because there would be no trips associated with hotel and restaurant facilities. Under the proposed project, increases in peak hour traffic volumes (when compared to existing or baseline conditions) would range from 3 (under non-event conditions) to 16 percent (under event conditions). To achieve a perceptible noise increase, traffic volumes would need to double. Therefore, because traffic volumes would not be doubled, traffic-related noise levels would result in a less-than-significant impact, but it would be reduced in magnitude because there would be no contribution by traffic associated with operation of hotel and restaurant facilities. The cumulative increase in traffic noise sources associated with this alternative would be similar to the proposed project under both non-event and event conditions, and increases in traffic associated with this alternative would still contribute to cumulative significant and unavoidable impacts; however, cumulative noise impacts for this alternative would be reduced in magnitude.

Biological Resources

Identical to the proposed project, development of the site with more intensive land uses would require the relocation of Environmental Horticulture teaching and research field activities and construction of associated support structures. This would result in the conversion of approximately two additional acres of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat. Identical to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 (which requires approximately two acres of support use in the west campus be redesignated to Teaching and Research Fields) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Also identical to the proposed project, the cumulative conversion of Agricultural Land and Annual Grassland habitat, would remain the same as the 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised. This cumulative conversion is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

Relationship to Project Objectives

The Conference Center without the Hotel and Restaurant Facilities Alternative could achieve some, but not all, of the objectives for the proposed project. This alternative would provide a venue for academic conferences on campus, provide an opportunity to host other events, add to the campus’ role as a regional academic and arts center and meeting place in combination with adjacent uses including the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center and the Center for the Arts Performance Hall, and provide access and exposure to the campus for the broader community. However, without the hotel and restaurant facilities, the ability of this alternative to achieve these objectives would be limited because the conference facility would be a less desirable location to hold conferences. Conference planners for academic conferences in particular, seek facilities that adequately provide for multi-day conferences. In addition, without the revenue generated by the hotel, an operator would be less likely to fund the conference center and afford all of the proposed design standards and amenities. Therefore, the conference center without a hotel is not expected to be a financially viable project.
This alternative could achieve all of the objectives for the Graduate School of Management Building.

**Conference Center with Reduced Size Hotel**

This alternative assumes the proposed conference center would be developed on the proposed project site with a 50-room hotel and restaurant and pub facilities. Although the project under this alternative would be less financially viable because there would be less revenue generated by a smaller hotel (fewer conferences would be attracted to a facility that could not adequately provide overnight accommodations), this alternative is analyzed to provide a basis for analyzing effects of a smaller scale project. The Graduate School of Management Building would be constructed and operated consistent with the proposed project. The Department of Environmental Horticulture teaching and research fields would be relocated to the west campus, north of Hutchison Drive near the University Airport.

**Land Use and Planning**

Under this alternative, a smaller hotel (50-room compared to 75-room with the proposed project) would be constructed and operated. Like the proposed project, there would be no contribution to any physical deterioration in the City, and there would be no conflict with City of Davis General Plan land use and related economic and business development policies.

**Transportation and Circulation**

Implementation of this alternative would result in similar increases in traffic volumes when compared to the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would result in an approximately three percent increase in traffic under non-event conditions. However, these volumes would be reduced in magnitude because there would be fewer trips attributed to a smaller hotel. Impacts under event conditions would also be similar to those of the proposed project. Under event conditions, increases in traffic volumes would be expected to increase by 10 to 16 percent when compared to existing conditions. Under non-event conditions, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would contribute traffic to intersections in the City of Davis that currently operate at an unacceptable LOS under existing conditions: Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, and Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive.

Under event conditions, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would contribute traffic to the two previously mentioned intersections that operate at an unacceptable LOS, and increases in traffic volumes resulting from event condition 2 would reduce the LOS at California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to an unacceptable level. However, impacts under non-event and event conditions would be reduced in magnitude because there would be fewer trips associated with a smaller hotel. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(a) (which requires the implementation of manual traffic controls) would reduce the magnitude of the significant impact at California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level for this alternative. Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) would reduce the magnitude of this impact for the
intersection of Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, but it is outside the jurisdiction of the University to implement. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and anavoidable.

The cumulative increase in traffic would be similar to the proposed project under both non-event and event conditions. Under non-event conditions, this alternative would contribute traffic to the exceedances of 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance at the intersections of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road, Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramp, and Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive. However, impacts under non-event conditions would be reduced in magnitude because there would be fewer trips associated with a smaller hotel. Implementation of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would reduce the magnitude of this impact, but implementation of improvements at some intersections are not in the jurisdiction of the University to implement and monitor.

Under cumulative event conditions, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would contribute traffic that would not result in exceedances of 1994 standards of significance at the intersections of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road (with mitigation), Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramps (with mitigation), and Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road (event condition 2). 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance would continue to be exceeded at the intersections of Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramp, and Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive. However, impacts under event conditions would be reduced in magnitude because there would be fewer trips associated with a smaller. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(a) (which requires the implementation of manual traffic controls) would reduce the magnitude of the significant impact at the intersections of Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramps and Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level for this alternative. Implementation of Project Specific Mitigation Measures 4.3-1(a) and (b) would reduce the impact at the intersection of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(b) would reduce the magnitude of this impact at intersections in the City, but this impact would remain significant and unavoidable because portions of this measure are outside the jurisdiction of the University to implement.

The Conference Center with Reduced Size Hotel Alternative would include surface parking spaces on-site to serve guests of the building’s proposed uses. Similar to the proposed project, additional parking would be available in existing parking facilities, including 885 surface parking spaces in Parking Lots 1 and 2 and 716 spaces in the South Entry Parking Structure. In addition, an additional 536 spaces could be made available with the use of stacked parking. This alternative would result in a less parking demand than the proposed project. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, adequate parking would be available and this impact would be less than significant; however, it would be reduced in magnitude.

**Noise**

The Conference Center with Reduced Size Hotel Alternative would result in similar increases in vehicle trip volumes when compared to the proposed project, but it would result in fewer vehicle
trips because there would be a smaller hotel. Under the proposed project, increases in peak hour traffic volumes (when compared to existing or baseline conditions) would range from 3 (under non-event conditions) to 16 percent (under event conditions). To achieve a perceptible noise increase, traffic volumes would need to double. Therefore, because traffic volumes would not be doubled, traffic-related noise levels would result in a less-than-significant impact, but it would be reduced in magnitude. The cumulative increase in traffic noise sources associated with this alternative would be similar to the proposed project under both non-event and event conditions and increases in traffic with this alternative would still contribute to cumulative significant and unavoidable impacts; however, cumulative noise impacts for this alternative would be reduced in magnitude because the hotel would be smaller in size.

Biological Resources

Identical to the proposed project, development of the site with more intensive land uses would require the relocation of Environmental Horticulture teaching and research field activities and construction of associated support structures. This would result in the conversion of approximately two additional acres of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat. Identical to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 (which requires approximately two acres of support use in the west campus be redesignated to Teaching and Research Fields) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Also identical to the proposed project, the cumulative conversion of Agricultural Land and Annual Grassland habitat would remain the same as identified in the 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised. This cumulative conversion is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

Relationship to Project Objectives

The Conference Center with Reduced Size Hotel Alternative could achieve some, but not all, of the objectives for the proposed project. This alternative would provide a venue for academic conferences on campus, provide an opportunity to host other events, add to the campus’ role as a regional academic and arts center and meeting place in combination with adjacent uses including the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center and the Center for the Arts Performance Hall, and provide access and exposure to the campus for the broader community. However, with a smaller hotel facility, the ability of this alternative to achieve these objectives would be limited because the conference facility would be a less desirable location to hold conferences. Conference planners, for academic conferences in particular, seek facilities that adequately provide for multi-day conferences. In addition, with less revenue generated by the hotel, an operator would be less likely to fund the conference center and afford all of the proposed design standards and amenities. The conference center with a reduced size hotel would be less financially viable.

This alternative could achieve all of the objectives for the Graduate School of Management Building.

South Campus Site Alternative

Under this alternative, the proposed conference center, hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building would be constructed on approximately five acres of the I-80 Enterprise
6. Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Reserve south of I-80. Because they would not be affected under this alternative, the Department of Environmental Horticulture teaching and research field activities would not be relocated.

**Land Use and Planning**

Under the South Campus Site Alternative, the proposed project would be developed as described in the project description, on five acres of the 38-acre I-80 Enterprise Reserve. The I-80 Enterprise Reserve is designated High Density Academic and Administrative-Potential Enterprise Opportunity. Surrounding land uses around the I-80 Enterprise Reserve include Animal Resources Services to the east, the Plant Pathology Field Headquarters and research fields to the south, and I-80 to the north and west. The proposed South Campus Site Alternative would be consistent with the alternative sites 1994 LRDP land use designations and would not conflict with adjacent land uses.

Because the South Campus Site Alternative would result in the same type of uses as the proposed project, this alternative would not contribute to any physical deterioration in the City and would not conflict with City of Davis General Plan land use and related economic and business development policies.

**Transportation and Circulation**

The 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR evaluated the addition of 15 acres to the existing 23-acre I-80 Enterprise Reserve. The SEIR concluded that increases in traffic volumes associated with development of the entire 38 acre I-80 Enterprise Reserve would not result in LOS standard violations. The traffic analysis was based on a conservative analysis of an additional 1,200 employees generating 3,516 daily motorized vehicle trips, including 549 trips during the a.m. peak hour and 495 trips during the p.m. peak hour. Under non-event and event condition 1, the conference center, hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building is anticipated to add 1,742 and 2,992 trips, respectively. Therefore, non-event and event condition 1 trip generation would be within the analysis prepared in the SEIR for the I-80 Enterprise Reserve Addition, and there would be no anticipated LOS exceedances in the project vicinity.

Under event condition 2, increases in traffic volumes would be expected to increase by up to 16 percent when compared to existing conditions. Under event condition 2, it is unlikely that this alternative would contribute significant traffic to intersections in the City of Davis that currently operate at an unacceptable LOS under existing conditions, (Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, and Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive) or to the intersection of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road because of the distance between the alternative site and the Center for Performing Arts. Therefore, event condition traffic impacts would be similar, but reduced in magnitude. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(a) (which requires the implementation of manual traffic controls) would reduce the magnitude of the significant impact at California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level for this alternative. Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) would reduce the magnitude of this impact for the intersection of Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, but it is outside the jurisdiction of the
University to implement. No feasible improvements exist for the intersection of Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The cumulative increase in traffic would be similar to the proposed project under both non-event and event conditions. Under cumulative non-event conditions, this alternative would contribute traffic to the exceedances of 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance at the intersections of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road, Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramp, and Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive. However, impacts under non-event conditions would be reduced in magnitude because these intersections would likely not provide primary access to the south campus site. Implementation of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3–1 would reduce the magnitude of this impact, but implementation of improvements at some intersections are not in the jurisdiction of the University to implement and monitor.

Under cumulative event conditions, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would contribute traffic that would not result in exceedances of 1994 standards of significance at the intersections of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road (with mitigation), Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramps (with mitigation), and Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road (event condition 2). 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance would continue to be exceeded at the intersections of Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramp, and Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive. However, impacts under event conditions would be reduced in magnitude because of the distance between the alternative site and the Center for Performing Arts. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(a) (which requires the implementation of manual traffic controls) would reduce the magnitude of the significant impact at the intersections of Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramps and Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level for this alternative. Implementation of Project Specific Mitigation Measures 4.3-1(a) and (b) would reduce the impact at the intersection of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(b) would reduce the magnitude of this impact at intersections in the City, but this impact would remain significant and unavoidable because portions of this measure are outside the jurisdiction of the University to implement.

Similar to the proposed project, 100 surface parking spaces would be provided on-site. However, additional parking would be needed to adequately accommodate parking demand associated with the project. Therefore, unlike the proposed project, impacts to parking capacity would be significant. To fulfill demand for parking other additional parking would need to be provided in the Enterprise Reserve or additional transit to transport conference attendees and hotel guests to and from parking lots in the South Entry area would be required.

Noise

This alternative would result in similar increases in vehicle trip volumes when compared to the proposed project. Under the proposed project, increases in peak hour traffic volumes (when
compared to existing or baseline conditions) would range from 3 (under non-event conditions) to 16 percent (under event conditions). To achieve a perceptible noise increase, traffic volumes would need to double. Therefore, because traffic volumes would not be doubled, similar to the proposed project, traffic-related noise levels would result in a less-than-significant impact. However, the impact would be reduced in magnitude because, under event condition 2, traffic would be spread out over a larger geographic area (due to the distance between the conference center and the Center for the Performing Arts). The cumulative increase in traffic noise sources associated with this alternative would be similar to the proposed project under both non-event and event conditions and increases in traffic with this alternative would still contribute to cumulative significant and unavoidable impact; however, noise impacts for this alternative would be reduced in magnitude.

Biological Resources

The I-80 Enterprise Reserve area is designated as Agricultural Land, which provides suitable foraging habitat for Swainson’s hawk. Development of the South Campus Site Alternative at that location would result in the conversion of approximately five acres of Agricultural Land. In addition, to accommodate additional on-site parking, more Agricultural Land would most likely be developed. However, the potential loss of Swainson’s hawk habitat in the I-80 Enterprise Reserve due to Agricultural Land conversion was previously evaluated as part of the 1997-98 Major Capital Improvement Projects SEIR, which identified Mitigation Measure 5.3-2 to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. While this alternative would not result in any project-level new or significant impacts related to Swainson’s hawk habitat (or other biological resources), it would result in the conversion of more potential habitat than the proposed project (five acres, as compared to two acres). Similar to the proposed project, the cumulative loss of Agricultural Land and Annual Grassland habitat would remain the same as in the 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised. This cumulative conversion is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

Relationship to Project Objectives

Construction of the Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building on five acres in the South Campus would not achieve several project objectives for the proposed project, including adding to the campus’ role as a regional academic and arts center and meeting place in combination with the adjacent Buehler Alumni Visitors Center and Center for the Arts Performance. Due to the distance from adequate parking, additional parking would need to be constructed as part of the alternative and/or shuttle service would need to be provided to and from the South Entry area. Costs associated with the provision of adequate parking would make this alternative less financially feasible. This alternative would provide space for University Relations and Graduate School of Management functions. The site’s location adjacent to I-80 would be consistent with project objectives addressing access and exposure.

West of the South Entry Parking Structure Site Alternative

The proposed project would be constructed on a site west of the South Entry Parking Structure. All elements of the project would be the same under this alternative.
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**Land Use and Planning**

Under this alternative, like the proposed project, there would be no contribution to any physical deterioration in the City, and there would be no conflict with City of Davis General Plan land use and related economic and business development policies.

**Transportation and Circulation**

Implementation of this alternative would result in similar increases in traffic volumes when compared to the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would result in an approximately three percent increase in traffic under non-event conditions. Increased traffic volumes would affect the same intersections due to this alternative site’s proximity to the proposed project site. Under event conditions, increases in traffic volumes would be expected to increase by 10 to 16 percent when compared to existing conditions. Under non-event conditions, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would contribute traffic to intersections in the City of Davis that currently operate at an unacceptable LOS under existing conditions: Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, and Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive.

Under event conditions, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would contribute traffic to the two previously mentioned intersections that operate at an unacceptable LOS, and increases in traffic volumes resulting from event condition 2 would reduce the LOS at California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to an unacceptable level. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(a) (which requires the implementation of manual traffic controls) would reduce the magnitude of the significant impact at California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level for this alternative. Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) would reduce the magnitude of this impact for the intersection of Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, but it is outside the jurisdiction of the University to implement. No feasible improvements exist for the intersection of Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The cumulative increase in traffic would be similar to the proposed project under both non-event and event conditions. Under non-event conditions, this alternative would contribute traffic that would result in exceedances of 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance at the intersections of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road, Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramp, and Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive. Implementation of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would reduce the magnitude of this impact, but implementation of improvements at some intersections are not in the jurisdiction of the University to implement and monitor.

Under cumulative event conditions, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would contribute traffic that would not result in exceedances of 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance at the intersections of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road (with mitigation), Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramps (with mitigation), and Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road (event condition 2). 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance would continue to be exceeded at the intersections of Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street,
Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramp, and Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(a) (which requires the implementation of manual traffic controls) would reduce the magnitude of the significant impact at the intersections of Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramps and Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level for this alternative. Implementation of Project Specific Mitigation Measures 4.3-1(a) and (b) would reduce the impact at the intersection of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(b) would reduce the magnitude of this impact at intersections in the City, but this impact would remain significant and unavoidable because portions of this measure are outside the jurisdiction of the University to implement.

This alternative would include surface parking spaces on-site to serve guests of the building’s proposed uses. Similar to the proposed project, additional parking would be available in existing parking facilities, including 885 surface parking spaces in Parking Lots 1 and 2 and 716 spaces in the South Entry Parking Structure. In addition, an additional 536 spaces could be made available with the use of stacked parking. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, adequate parking would be available and this impact would be less than significant.

Noise

This alternative would result in similar increases in vehicle trip volumes when compared to the proposed project. Under the proposed project, increases in peak hour traffic volumes (when compared to existing or baseline conditions) would range from 3 (under non event conditions) to 16 percent (under event conditions). To achieve a perceptible noise increase, traffic volumes would need to double. Therefore, because traffic volumes would not be doubled, traffic-related noise levels would result in a less-than-significant impact. The cumulative increase in traffic noise sources associated with this alternative would be similar to the proposed project under both non-event and event conditions and increases in traffic with this alternative would still contribute to cumulative significant and unavoidable impacts.

Biological Resources

Similar to the proposed project, development of the site with more intensive land uses would require the relocation of existing teaching and research field activities and construction of associated support structures elsewhere. This would result in the conversion of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat. An additional four acres of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat could be lost under this alternative as compared to the proposed project. Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 (which requires support use in the west campus be redesignated to Teaching and Research Fields) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. As for the proposed project, the cumulative conversion of Agricultural Land and Annual Grassland habitat would remain the same as the 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised. The cumulative conversion is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.
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Relationship to Project Objectives

The West of the South Entry Parking Structure Site Alternative could achieve most, but not all, of the objectives for the proposed project. This alternative would not provide for as strategic interaction with the Buehler Alumni and Visitors Center and the Center for the Performing Arts because of the distance of approximately 300 feet. Therefore, this alternative would not contribute as well to the campus’ role as a regional academic and arts center and meeting place.

This alternative could achieve all of the objectives for the Graduate School of Management Building.

Hutchinson Drive and La Rue Road Site Alternative

The proposed project would be constructed on a site in the central campus southwest of the intersection of Hutchison Drive and La Rue Road. The site is currently designated as PE/ICA/Recreation. All elements of the project would be the same under this alternative.

Land Use and Planning

Under this Alternative, the proposed project would be developed at the intersection of Hutchison Drive and La Rue Road. The site is currently undeveloped and is designated as PE/ICA/Recreation in the 1994 LRDP. Implementation of this alternative would require an amendment to the 1994 LRDP to redesignate the site as High Density Academic and Administrative – Potential Enterprise Opportunity and Parking. The campus is currently considering this site for a proposed new stadium and associated athletic fields. Another site would have to be found for recreation fields or a stadium if the project was built at this location. Because there are no large undeveloped areas on the central campus designated for PE/ICA/Recreation, a new site for recreation fields or a stadium likely would be located west of SR 113 and would result in the loss of prime agricultural land.

Because the Hutchinson Drive and La Rue Road Site Alternative would result in the same type of uses as the proposed project, this alternative would not contribution to any physical deterioration in the City and would not conflict with City of Davis General Plan land use and related economic and business development policies.

Transportation and Circulation

Implementation of this alternative would result in similar increases in traffic volumes when compared to the proposed project. However, this project would directly affect several intersection that are not directly affected by the proposed project in the vicinity of the alternative site, including the intersections of SR113 and Russell and SR113 and Hutchison which operate at acceptable LOS under current conditions. It is anticipated that under non-event conditions, this alternative would not cause LOS exceedances. An event at the conference center could result in a significant increase in traffic potentially resulting in an LOS exceedance at intersections in the vicinity of the alternative site that were not identified for the proposed project.
Under event conditions, it is unlikely that this alternative would contribute significant traffic to intersections in the City of Davis that currently operate at an unacceptable LOS under existing conditions, (Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, and Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive) or to the intersection of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road because of the distance between the alternative site and these intersections. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(a) (which requires the implementation of manual traffic controls) would reduce the magnitude of the significant impact at California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level for this alternative. Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) would reduce the magnitude of this impact for the intersection of Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, but it is outside the jurisdiction of the University to implement. No feasible improvements exist for the intersection of Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The cumulative increase in traffic would be similar to the proposed project under both non-event and event conditions. Under non-event conditions, this alternative would contribute traffic that would result in exceedances of 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance at the intersections of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road, Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramp, and Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive. However, impacts under event conditions would be reduced in magnitude because of the distance between the alternative site and these intersections. Implementation of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would reduce the magnitude of this impact, but implementation of improvements at some intersections are not in the jurisdiction of the University to implement and monitor.

Under cumulative event conditions, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would contribute traffic that would not result in exceedances of 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance at the intersections of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road (with mitigation), Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramps (with mitigation), and Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road (event condition 2). 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance would continue to be exceeded at the intersections of Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramp, and Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive. However, impacts under cumulative event conditions would be reduced in magnitude because of the distance between the alternative site and the Center for Performing Arts. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(a) (which requires the implementation of manual traffic controls) would reduce the magnitude of the significant impact at the intersections of Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramps and Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level for this alternative. Implementation of Project Specific Mitigation Measures 4.3-1(a) and (b) would reduce the impact at the intersection of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(b) would reduce the magnitude of this impact at intersections in the City, but this impact would remain significant and unavoidable because portions of this measure are outside the jurisdiction of the University to implement.
Existing parking in the vicinity of this alternative site has limited capacity. Parking utilization (Winter 2001) for Parking Lots 25 and 25A (with a combination of 752 parking spaces) was at 98 percent. Parking Lot 35 (at the intersection of Orchard Park Drive and LaRue Road) is at 54 percent utilization; however it only has 219 parking spaces. Therefore, parking for the conference center and hotel facilities under this alternative would be limited and this would be a significant impact. Construction of additional surface underground parking on-site or off-site parking facilities and/or increased shuttle service would increase project costs and make this alternative less financially feasible.

Noise

This alternative would result in similar increases in vehicle trip volumes when compared to the proposed project. Under the proposed project, increases in peak hour traffic volumes (when compared to existing or baseline conditions) would range from 3 (under non event conditions) to 16 percent (under event conditions). To achieve a perceptible noise increase, traffic volumes would need to double. Therefore, because traffic volumes would not be doubled, similar to the proposed project, traffic-related noise levels would result in a less-than-significant impact. However, the impact would be reduced in magnitude because, under event conditions, traffic would be spread out over a larger geographic area due to the distance between the Center for the Performing Arts and this alternative conference center site.

The cumulative increase in traffic noise sources would be similar to the proposed project under both non-event and event conditions and increases in traffic with this alternative would still contribute to cumulative significant and unavoidable impacts; however, noise impacts for this alternative would be reduced in magnitude due to the distance between the Center for the Performing Arts and this alternative conference center site.

Biological Resources

Unlike the proposed project, development of this alternative would not require the relocation of Environmental Horticulture teaching and research field activities and construction of associated support structures, and the associated conversion of approximately two additional acres of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat would not occur. Construction of the proposed project at this location would, however, result in conversion of several acres of Annual-Ruderal Grassland habitat on the site and would increase associated biological impacts to an extent that would not occur under the proposed project due to the need to find a site for recreation fields or a stadium. Depending on the location selected for the proposed stadium and associated athletic fields that could be displaced, this alternative could result in a further loss of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat.

Relationship to Project Objectives

The Hutchison Drive and La Rue Road Site Alternative could achieve some, but not all of the objectives for the proposed project. This alternative would provide a venue for academic conferences on campus and provide an opportunity to host other events. This alternative would not achieve objectives for the proposed project, including adding to the campus’ role as a...
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regional academic and arts center and meeting place in combination with the adjacent Buehler Alumni Visitors Center and Center for the Arts Performance Hall. Due lack of adequate parking in the vicinity of the alternative site, additional parking would need to be constructed as part of the alternative and/or shuttle service would need to be provided. Costs associated with the provision of adequate parking would make this alternative less financially feasible.

Hotel at First and A Streets Site Alternative

The proposed conference center and hotel would be constructed on Parking Lot 10 at the intersection of First and A Streets. Due to small size of the site, the facility would need to be one or more stories taller than the proposed project. The construction of additional stories would make this alternative less financially feasible. Due to the site size, it is also assumed that minimal parking could be accommodated on the project site. Shuttle service could also be provided to and from other parking facilities in the central campus. Construction of off-site parking facilities and/or increased shuttle service would increase project costs and would also make this alternative less financially feasible.

The Graduate School of Management Building would be constructed at the proposed project location. The Department of Environmental Horticulture teaching and research fields would be relocated to the west campus to accommodate the Graduate School of Management Building.

Land Use and Planning

Under this alternative, the conference center and hotel would be developed at the intersection of First and A Streets on Parking Lot 10. The site is currently used for parking and is designated as Parking in the 1994 LRDP. Implementation of this alternative would require an amendment to the 1994 LRDP to redesignate the site from Parking to High Density Academic and Administrative – Potential Enterprise Opportunity.

Because the Conference Center and Hotel at First and A Streets Alternative would result in the same type of uses as the proposed project, this alternative would not contribute to any physical deterioration in the City and would not conflict with City of Davis General Plan land use and related economic and business development policies.

Transportation and Circulation

Implementation of this alternative would result in similar increases in traffic volumes when compared to the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would result in an approximately three percent increase in traffic under non-event conditions. Increased traffic volumes would likely affect the same intersections as the proposed project; however, this alternative would likely directly affect the intersection of First Street and A Street, an intersection not directly affected by proposed project traffic volumes. Under event conditions, increases in traffic volumes would be expected to increase by 10 to 16 percent when compared to existing conditions. Under non-event conditions, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would contribute traffic to intersections in the City of Davis that currently operate at an unacceptable
LOS under existing conditions; Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, and Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive.

Under event conditions, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would contribute traffic to the two previously mentioned intersections that operate at an unacceptable LOS. It is unlikely, due to the location of the site, that this alternative would result in a LOS exceedance at the intersection of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road. Therefore, event condition traffic impacts would be similar, but reduced in magnitude. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(a) (which requires the implementation of manual traffic controls) would reduce the magnitude of the significant impact at California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level for this alternative. Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) would reduce the magnitude of this impact for the intersection of Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, but it is outside the jurisdiction of the University to implement. No feasible improvements exist for the intersection of Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The cumulative increase in traffic would be similar to the proposed project under both non-event and event conditions. Under non-event conditions, this alternative would contribute traffic to the exceedances of 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance at the intersections of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road, Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramp, and Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive. However, impacts under event conditions would be reduced in magnitude because of the distance between the alternative site and the Center for Performing Arts. Implementation of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would reduce the magnitude of this impact, but implementation of improvements at some intersections are not in the jurisdiction of the University to implement and monitor.

Under cumulative event conditions, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would contribute traffic that would not result in exceedances of 1994 standards of significance at the intersections of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road (with mitigation), Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramps (with mitigation), and Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road (event condition 2). 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance would continue to be exceeded at the intersections of Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramp, and Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive. However, impacts under event conditions would be reduced in magnitude because of the distance between the alternative site and the Center for Performing Arts. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(a) (which requires the implementation of manual traffic controls) would reduce the magnitude of the significant impact at the intersections of Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramps and Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level for this alternative. Implementation of Project Specific Mitigation Measures 4.3-1(a) and (b) would reduce the impact at the intersection of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(b) would reduce the magnitude of this impact at intersections in the City, but this impact would remain significant.
and unavoidable because portions of this measure are outside the jurisdiction of the University to implement.

Under this alternative, it is assumed that minimal parking could be provided on-site due to site size constraints. In addition, construction of the proposed uses at this site would displace Parking Lot 10 (304 spaces), which is one of the few parking lots on the east side of campus. To replace lost parking, additional parking would need to be provided elsewhere in the core campus and no sites are available in this developed part of campus. Existing parking in the project vicinity has limited capacity. Parking utilization (Winter 2001) for Parking Lot 5 and 5A was 99 to 100 percent. Therefore, parking for the conference center and hotel facilities under this alternative would be severely limited and this would be a significant impact. Construction of underground or off-site parking facilities and/or increased shuttle service would increase project costs and make this alternative less financially feasible.

**Noise**

This alternative would result in similar increases in vehicle trip volumes when compared to the proposed project. Under the proposed project, increases in peak hour traffic volumes (when compared to existing or baseline conditions) would range from 3 (under non event conditions) to 16 percent (under event conditions). To achieve a perceptible noise increase, traffic volumes would need to double. Therefore, because traffic volumes would not be doubled, similar to the proposed project, traffic-related noise levels would result in a less-than-significant impact. However, the impact would be reduced in magnitude because, under event conditions, traffic would be spread out over a larger geographic area due to the distance between the Center for the Performing Arts and this alternative conference center site. Unlike the proposed project, increased traffic-generated noise associated with this alternative would expose sensitive residential uses that currently exist in the vicinity of First and A Streets.

The cumulative increase in traffic noise sources would be similar to the proposed project under both non-event and event conditions and increases in traffic with this alternative would still contribute to cumulative significant and unavoidable impacts; however, cumulative noise impacts for this alternative would be reduced in magnitude due to the distance between the Center for the Performing Arts and this alternative conference center site.

**Biological Resources**

Identical to the proposed project, development of the proposed project site with more intensive land uses (Graduate School of Management Building) would require the relocation of Environmental Horticulture teaching and research field activities and construction of associated support structures. This would result in the conversion of approximately two additional acres of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat. Identical to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 (which requires approximately two acres of support use in the west campus be redesignated to Teaching and Research Fields) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Also identical to the proposed project, the cumulative conversion of Agricultural Land and Annual Grassland habitat would remain the same as the 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised, which is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.
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Relationship to Project Objectives

The Conference Center and Hotel at First and A Streets Alternative could achieve some, but not all of the objectives for the proposed project. This alternative would provide a venue for academic conferences on campus and provide an opportunity to host other events. This alternative would not achieve some objectives for the proposed project, including adding to the campus’ role as a regional academic and arts center and meeting place in combination with the adjacent Buehler Alumni Visitors Center and Center for the Arts Performance Hall. Due to the distance from adequate parking, additional parking would need to be constructed as part of the alternative and/or shuttle service would need to be provided. Costs associated with the provision of adequate parking would make this alternative less financially feasible. In addition, its location would not provide adequate access and exposure to the campus for the broader community. The area from north of the A Street and First Street intersection to the Solano Park housing on the south side of the Arboretum Waterway is a known archaeological site. The alternative site on Parking Lot 10 is in the center of this cultural resource site. Cultural artifacts and human remains have been found throughout the area including on the Parking Lot 5 site. Therefore, this alternative would have a significant impact on cultural resources that would not be caused by the proposed project.

This alternative could achieve all of the objectives for the Graduate School of Management Building.

Russell Boulevard and A Street Site Alternative

Under this alternative, the proposed conference center and hotel facilities would be constructed at the intersection of Russell Boulevard and A Street, and the Graduate School of Management Building would be constructed at the proposed project location consistent with the proposed project. The Department of Environmental Horticulture teaching and research fields would be relocated to the west campus to accommodate the Graduate School of Management Building.

Because adequate parking facilities do not currently exist at the Russell Boulevard and A Street site, more parking would need to be constructed than identified with the proposed project. Due to the site size, it is assumed that minimal parking could be accommodated on the project site. Shuttle service could also be provided to and from other parking facilities in the central campus. Construction of underground or off-site parking facilities and/or increased shuttle service would increase project costs and make this alternative less financially feasible.

Land Use and Planning

Under this alternative, the conference center and hotel would be developed at the intersection of Russell Boulevard and A Street. The Russell Boulevard and A Street site is currently occupied by Toomey Field and adjacent intramural athletic fields. The site is designated as PE/ICA Recreation in the 1994 LRDP. Implementation of this alternative would require an amendment to the 1994 LRDP to redesignate the site as High Density Academic and Administrative – Potential Enterprise Opportunity. Construction of this alternative would also require
replacement of the existing Toomey Field facilities and intramural athletic fields elsewhere on campus. These impacts would not occur with the proposed project. Because the Conference Center and Hotel at Russell Boulevard and A Street Alternative would result in the same type of uses as the proposed project, this alternative would not contribution to any physical deterioration in the City and would not conflict with City of Davis General Plan land use and related economic and business development policies.

Transportation and Circulation

Implementation of this alternative would result in similar increases in traffic volumes when compared to the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would result in an approximately three percent increase in traffic under non-event conditions. Increased traffic volumes would likely affect the same intersections as the proposed project; however, this alternative would likely directly affect the intersection of Russell Boulevard and A Street, an intersection not directly affected by proposed project traffic volumes. This intersection currently operates at LOS “B”. Under event conditions, increases in traffic volumes would be expected to increase by 10 to 16 percent when compared to existing conditions. Under non-event conditions, it is anticipated that this alternative would not cause LOS exceedances at the Russell Boulevard and A Street intersection. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would contribute traffic to intersections in the City of Davis that currently operate at an unacceptable LOS under existing conditions; Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, and Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive.

Under event conditions, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would contribute traffic to the two previously mentioned intersections that operate at an unacceptable LOS. It is unlikely, due to the location of the site, that this alternative would result in a LOS exceedance at the intersection of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road. Therefore, event condition traffic impacts would be similar, but reduced in magnitude. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(a) (which requires the implementation of manual traffic controls) would reduce the magnitude of the significant impact at California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level for this alternative. Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(b) would reduce the magnitude of this impact for the intersection of Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, but it is outside the jurisdiction of the University to implement. No feasible improvements exist for the intersection of Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The cumulative increase in traffic would be similar to the proposed project under both non-event and event conditions. Under non-event conditions, this alternative would contribute traffic to the exceedances of 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance at the intersections of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road, Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramp, and Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive. However, impacts under event conditions would be reduced in magnitude because of the distance between the alternative site and the Center for Performing Arts. Implementation of 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1 would reduce
the magnitude of this impact, but implementation of improvements at some intersections are not in the jurisdiction of the University to implement and monitor.

Under cumulative event conditions, similar to the proposed project, this alternative would contribute traffic that would not result in exceedances of 1994 standards of significance at the intersections of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road (with mitigation), Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramps (with mitigation), and Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road (event condition 2). 1994 LRDP EIR standards of significance would continue to be exceeded at the intersections of Richards Boulevard and First Street/E Street, Richards Boulevard and Olive Drive, Richards Boulevard and I-80 Eastbound Ramp, and Richards Boulevard and Research Park Drive. However, impacts under event conditions would be reduced in magnitude because of the distance between the alternative site and the Center for Performing Arts. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(a) (which requires the implementation of manual traffic controls) would reduce the magnitude of the significant impact at the intersections of Old Davis Road and I-80 Eastbound Ramps and Mrak Hall Drive and Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level for this alternative. Implementation of Project Specific Mitigation Measures 4.3-1(a) and (b) would reduce the impact at the intersection of California Avenue and Realigned Old Davis Road to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.3-3(b) would reduce the magnitude of this impact at intersections in the City, but this impact would remain significant and unavoidable because portions of this measure are outside the jurisdiction of the University to implement.

Under this alternative, it is assumed that minimal on-site parking could be provided on-site due to site size constraints. Existing parking in the vicinity of the alternative site has limited capacity. Parking utilization (Winter 2001) for the North Entry Parking Structure was 95 to 100 percent. Parking Lot 10 (at the intersection of First and A Streets) is at 86 percent utilization. Parking Lot 15 (at the intersection of California Avenue and Tennis Court Lane) is at 94 percent utilization. Therefore, parking for the conference center and hotel attendees under this alternative would be severely limited and this would be a significant impact. Construction of underground or off-site parking facilities and/or increased shuttle service to other parking areas on campus would increase project costs and make this alternative less financially feasible.

Noise

This alternative would result in similar increases in vehicle trip volumes when compared to the proposed project. Under the proposed project, increases in peak hour traffic volumes (when compared to existing or baseline conditions) would range from 3 (under non event conditions) to 16 percent (under event conditions). To achieve a perceptible noise increase, traffic volumes would need to double. Therefore, because traffic volumes would not be doubled, similar to the proposed project, traffic-related noise levels would result in a less-than-significant impact. However, the impact would be reduced in magnitude because, under event conditions, traffic would be spread out over a larger geographic area due to the distance between the Center for Performing Arts and this alternative conference center site. Unlike the proposed project, increased traffic-generated noise associated with this alternative would expose sensitive residential uses that currently exist in the vicinity of Russell and A Streets.
The cumulative increase in traffic noise sources would be similar to the proposed project under both non-event and event conditions and increases in traffic with this alternative would still contribute to cumulative significant and unavoidable impacts; however, noise impacts for this alternative would be reduced in magnitude due to the distance between the Center for Performing Arts and this alternative conference center site.

**Biological Resources**

Identical to the proposed project, development of the proposed project site with more intensive land uses (the Graduate School of Management Building) would require the relocation of Environmental Horticulture teaching and research field activities and construction of associated support structures. This would result in the conversion of approximately two additional acres of Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat. Identical to the proposed project, implementation of Project-Specific Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 (which requires approximately two acres of support use in the west campus be redesignated to Teaching and Research Fields) would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. Also identical to the proposed project, the cumulative conversion of Agricultural Land and Annual Grassland habitat would remain the same as in the 1994 LRDP EIR, as revised, which is considered a significant and unavoidable impact. Depending on the site identified for relocation of the existing Toomey Field facilities and of displaced intramural athletic fields, additional Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat could be lost under this alternative compared to losses associated with the proposed project.

**Relationship to Project Objectives**

The Conference Center and Hotel at Russell Boulevard and A Street Alternative could achieve some, but not all of the objectives for the proposed project. This alternative would provide a venue for academic conferences on campus and provide an opportunity to host other events. This alternative would not achieve some objectives for the proposed project, including adding to the campus’ role as a regional academic and arts center and meeting place in combination with the adjacent Buehler Alumni Visitors Center and Center for the Arts Performance Hall. Due to the distance from adequate parking, additional parking would need to be constructed as part of the alternative and/or shuttle service would need to be provided. Costs associated with the provision of adequate parking would make this alternative less financially feasible.

This alternative could achieve all of the objectives for the Graduate School of Management Building.

**Environmentally Superior Alternative**

An EIR is required to identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the reasonable range of alternatives evaluated (CEQA Section 15126.6(e)(2)). For the proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project, the No Project-No Development Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative because it avoids all the impacts identified for the proposed project. However, CEQA requires that if the
environmentally superior alternative is the No Project (No Development) alternative, an EIR should also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives.

Like the proposed project, the No Project-Expected Development Alternative would not contribute to the physical deterioration in the City of Davis and would not conflict with City of Davis General Plan land use and related economic and business development policies. In addition, this alternative would result in other impacts similar to the proposed project attributed to LOS exceedances, parking and noise. However, these impacts would be reduced in magnitude because event condition traffic would not occur without the conference center and hotel facilities. Also similar to the proposed project, this alternative would result in a loss of potential Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat.

Due to its proximity to the proposed project site, the West of the South Entry Parking Structure Site Alternative would result in similar impacts to the proposed project. The South Campus Site, Hutchison Drive and La Rue Road Site, First and A Streets Site, and the Russell Boulevard and A Street Site Alternatives would all result in new significant impacts not identified with the proposed project. All of these alternatives would result in significant parking impacts due to the lack of existing parking under event conditions at the project sites, and would therefore require that additional parking facilities be constructed that would not be required with the proposed project.

The Hutchison Drive and La Rue Road Site Alternative would require an LRDP amendment to redesignate the site from PE/ICA Recreation to High Density Academic and Administrative – Potential Enterprise Opportunity and Parking. In addition, this site is currently being considered by the campus for a proposed new stadium and associated athletic fields. A new site for these uses would have to be considered. This alternative would likely result in a greater loss of potential Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat than the proposed project. However, depending on the new location for the proposed stadium and associated athletic fields, the Hutchison Drive and La Rue Road Site Alternative could cause the loss of more potential Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat than that associated with the proposed project.

The First and A Streets Site Alternative would require an LRDP amendment to redesignate the site from Parking to High Density Academic and Administrative – Potential Enterprise Opportunity and Parking. Construction of the alternative at this location would also result in the removal of approximately 304 parking spaces (Parking Lot 10) that would need to be provided for elsewhere on campus. However, there are no additional sites for faculty/staff parking in this area of the campus. Furthermore, its proximity to sensitive residential uses could result in those uses being exposed to increased noise levels associated with increased traffic. A known archaeological resource on the site would be significantly affected by a project at this location.

Because the Russell Boulevard and A Street site is currently occupied by Toomey Field and by adjacent intramural athletic fields and is designated as PE/ICA Recreation in the 1994 LRDP, implementation of this alternative would require an amendment to the 1994 LRDP to redesignate the site as High Density Academic and Administrative – Potential Enterprise Opportunity and Parking. In addition, construction of the facilities at this site would also require relocation and construction of the existing Toomey Field facilities and replacement intramural athletic fields
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elsewhere on campus. Furthermore, its proximity to sensitive residential uses could result in those uses being exposed to increased noise levels associated with increased traffic. The Russell Boulevard and A Street Site Alternative could result in an increased loss of potential Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat compared to the proposed project if replacement recreation and athletic facilities are located west of SR 113.

The Conference Center without the Hotel and Restaurant Facilities Alternative and the Conference Center with Reduced Size Hotel Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternatives. Under these alternatives, the project would include development of the conference center and Graduate School of Management Building at the proposed project site. However, Conference Center without the Hotel and Restaurant Facilities Alternative would not include development of the hotel and restaurant facilities, and the Conference Center with Reduced Size Hotel Alternative would include development of a smaller hotel facility. Like the proposed project, these alternatives would not contribute to any physical deterioration in the City of Davis and would not conflict with City of Davis General Plan land use and related economic and business development policies.

Implementation of these alternatives would result in similar impacts to LOS at affected intersections and parking demand impacts compared to the proposed project; however, these impacts would be reduced in magnitude because there would be no trips attributed to the hotel and restaurant facilities and/or fewer trips associated with a smaller size hotel. Because there would be fewer vehicle trips, traffic-generated noise impacts would also be less in magnitude when compared to the proposed project. Like the proposed project, construction of these alternatives would require relocating the Environmental Horticulture teaching and research field activities, and would therefore, result in the same loss of potential Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat as the proposed project.

Even though the Conference Center without Hotel and Restaurant Facilities Alternative and the Conference Center with Reduced Size Hotel Alternative are the environmentally superior alternatives, they would not achieve all of the objectives of the proposed project. Without the hotel or with a reduced hotel, the conference center facility would be a less desirable location to hold conferences. Conference planners, for academic conferences in particular, seek facilities that adequately provide for multi-day conferences. In addition, without the revenue generated by a hotel, or with reduced revenue, an operator would be less likely to fund the conference center and afford all of the proposed design amenities. If feasible, these alternatives would however, provide a venue for housing conferences on campus that contribute to the campus’ role as regional academic and arts center and meeting place in combination with Buehler Alumni Visitors Center and Center for the Performing Arts.
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