4. LIST OF AGENCIES AND PERSONS COMMENTING
4. LIST OF AGENCIES AND PERSONS COMMENTING

The following agencies, organizations and individuals submitted letters that contained comments on the DEIR. Letter 17 consists of the transcript from the public hearing held for the DEIR on January 22, 2002.

Letter 1: Terry Roberts
Director, State Clearinghouse
Governor’s Office of Planning and Research
February 5, 2002

Letter 2: Sandy Hesnard
Aviation Environmental Planner
Department of Transportation
Division of Aeronautics
January 29, 2002

Letter 3: Jeffery Pulverman
Chief, Office of Regional Planning
Department of Transportation, District 3
February 3, 2002

Letter 4: Dave Rosenberg
Chairman, Yolo County Board of Supervisors
January 22, 2002

Letter 5: Bill Emlen
Planning and Building Director
City of Davis
February 6, 2002

Letter 6: Angela Reid
Chief Executive Officer
Davis Chamber of Commerce
February 6, 2002

Letter 7: Ashok Patel
February 6, 2002
Letter 8: Reed Youmans  
_February 6, 2002_

Letter 9: Peter Rock  
_December 21, 2001_

Letter 10: Judith S. Stern  
_December 26, 2001_

Letter 11: Elaine Fingerett  
_January 22, 2002_

Letter 12: Norman L. Rogers  
_February 6, 2002_

Attachment 12-1: Kenneth E. Lehrer, Ph.D.  
Lehrer Financial and Economic Advisory Services  
_February 5, 2002_

Attachment 12-2: Daniel T. Smith, Jr., P.E.  
Smith Engineering & Management  
_February 5, 2002_

Attachment 12-3: C. Daniel Vencill, Ph.D.  
Consulting Economist, Professor of Economics  
_San Francisco State University_  
_February 6, 2002_

Attachment 12-4: Robert Robinson  
_Hospitality Consultants_  
_October 24, 2000_

Attachment 12-5: C. Jay Scott, II, CRE  
Scott Hospitality Consultants  
_April 12, 2001_

Attachment 12-6: declaration of Ron Sharman  
_February 4, 2002_

Attachment 12-7: Articles from Sacramento Bee, Las Vegas Review-Journal, and The GRID, and UCCSN Board of Regents Meeting Minutes  
_Various dates_

Letter 13: Norman L. Rogers  
_February 7, 2002_

Letter 14: Fred Buder  
_February 7, 2002_
Letter 15: Jeremy Britto
Letter 16: Paul Gepts
Letter 17: Public Hearing Transcript
January 22, 2002
5. COMMENTS AND RESPONSES
5. COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Introduction

This chapter contains comment letters received on the DEIR and responses to comments. Each letter and each comment within a letter have been given a number. Responses are numbered so that they correspond to the appropriate comment. For example, the first comment on Comment Letter 1 is numbered 1-1. Where appropriate, responses are cross-referenced between letters. Comments that initiated changes to the text of the DEIR are shown by a line through text that has been deleted and are double underlined for new text that has been inserted.
February 5, 2002

Sid England
University of California, Davis
Office of Resource Management and Planning UC Davis
One Shields Avenue
Davis, CA 95616

Subject: Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building Project
SCH#: 2001083067

Dear Sid England:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on February 4, 2002, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project’s ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

“A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation.”

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Terry Roberts
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency
### Project Details Report

**State Clearinghouse Data Base**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCH#</th>
<th>2001082067</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Title</strong></td>
<td>Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Agency</strong></td>
<td>University of California, Davis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type** EIR Draft EIR

**Description** The project would construct and operate a conference center, a hotel, and a building for the Graduate School of Management on approximately five acres in the south entry area of the central campus. The project would relocate Department of Environmental Horticulture activities to a parcel in the west campus and provide associated support structures.

**Lead Agency Contact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sid England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency</strong></td>
<td>University of California, Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone</strong></td>
<td>530/752-2432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fax</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address</strong></td>
<td>Office of Resource Management and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td>One Shields Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zip</strong></td>
<td>95616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>County</strong></th>
<th>Yolo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City</strong></td>
<td>Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross Streets</strong></td>
<td>Old Davis Road, Mrak Hall Drive, Hutchison Dr./Olive Tree Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parcel No.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Township</strong></td>
<td>8N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range</strong></td>
<td>2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td>MtDiablo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proximity to:**

- **Highways**: SR 113 and I-80
- **Airports**: University Airport
- **Railways**: Union Pacific
- **Waterways**: Putah Creek
- **Schools**: Davis Joint Unified
- **Land Use**: High Density Academic and Administrative with Potential Enterprise Opportunity and Parking

### Project Issues

- Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Drainage/Absorption; Flood Plain/Flooding; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Septic System; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Wildlife; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Cumulative Effects

### Reviewing Agencies

- Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Game, Region 2; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 3; Regional Water Quality Control Bd., Region 5 (Sacramento); Department of Toxic Substances Control; Native American Heritage Commission; State Lands Commission; Other Agency(ies)

**Date Received** 12/21/2001  **Start of Review** 12/21/2001  **End of Review** 02/04/2002

**Note:** Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.
NOTICE OF COMPLETION
EXTENSION OF COMMENT PERIOD

Project Title: Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building Project

State Clearinghouse No.: 2001082067

Project Location: University of California, Davis
South of Old Davis Road and north of the Union Pacific Railroad Line; and north of Hutchison Drive and west of Olive Tree Drive (small component)

County: Yolo

The UC Davis campus (the campus) proposes to construct and operate a conference center, a hotel, and a building for the Graduate School of Management on approximately five acres in the south entry area of the central campus. A Draft Focused Tiered Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) and a Notice of Completion for the proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project were distributed for public and agency review on December 21, 2001. The 45-day comment period for the project's Draft EIR was scheduled to end on February 4, 2002. Due to a request from the City of Davis, the campus will extend the comment period on the Draft EIR to 12:00 p.m. on February 7, 2002.

Copies of the Draft EIR for the Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building project are available during normal operating hours at the UC Davis Office of Resource Management and Planning in 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 Library, 1020 Ulatis Drive, Vacaville; and online at http://www.ormp.ucdavis.edu/environreview/. Copies of all documents referenced in the Draft EIR are available at the UC Davis Office of Resource Management and Planning in 376 Mrak Hall on the UC Davis campus.
Comments on the Draft EIR must be received before 12:00 p.m. on February 7, 2002 and may be e-mailed to environreview@ucdavis.edu or mailed to:

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

If you have any questions about the project, please contact Sid England, UC Davis Environmental Planner, at (530) 752-2432.

Sincerely,

John A. Meyer  
Vice Chancellor - Resource Management and Planning

C: Mailed to addressees on attached list
Michael J. Bocchicchio  
Asst. Vice President – Facilities Administration  
University of California, Office of the President  
1111 Franklin Street 6th Floor #6201  
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

James E. Holst  
Office of the General Counsel of The Regents  
University of California  
300 Lakeside Drive, 7th Floor  
Oakland, CA 94612-3550

Phil Zeniner  
State Water Resources Control Board  
Division of Water Quality  
P.O. Box 100  
Sacramento, CA 95801

State of California  
Native American Heritage Commission  
915 Capitol Mall, Room 364  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Department of Toxic Substances Control  
400 P Street, 4th Floor  
Sacramento, CA 94814

Solano County Department of Environmental Management  
601 Texas Street  
Fairfield, CA 94533

Steve Olive  
Department of Conservation  
801 K Street, MS-24-02  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Jeffery Pulverman  
Caltrans, District 3  
703 B Street  
Marysville, CA 95901

State of California  
Office of Planning and Research  
1400 Tenth Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

County Clerk  
County of Yolo  
625 Court Street  
Woodland, CA 95695

Hans Kreutzberg  
Office of Historic Preservation  
P.O. Box 942896  
Sacramento, CA 94296-0001

Craig Stowers  
Department of Fish & Game  
7400 Hendon Way  
Elk Grove, CA 95758

County Clerk  
County of Solano  
600 Texas Street  
Fairfield, CA 94533

Bill Emlen  
City of Davis  
Community Development Director  
23 Russell Boulevard  
Davis, CA 95616
John Bencomo  
Planning Department  
County of Yolo  
292 West Beamer Street  
Woodland, CA 95695

Christopher Manske  
Solano County Planning  
601 Texas Street  
Fairfield, CA 94533

Thomas To  
Yolo County Department of Public Health  
Environmental Health Services  
10 Cottonwood Street  
Woodland, CA 95695

Environmental Services  
Department of Fish and Game  
1701 Nimbus Road, Suite A  
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Wayne White  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Ecological Services  
2800 Cottage Way #W-2605  
Sacramento, CA 95825-1888

Larry Green  
Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District  
1947 Galileo Court, Suite 103  
Davis, CA 95616

Richard McHenry  
Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board  
3443 Routier Road  
Sacramento, CA 95827-3098

Russell Huck  
Environmental Management Branch  
Department of Health Services  
P.O. Box 942732  
Sacramento, CA 94234-7320

Peter Venturini  
Air Resources Board  
1001 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Sue O'Leary  
Permitting and Inspection Branch, MS #15  
California Integrated Waste Management Board  
1001 I Street  
PO Box 4025  
Sacramento. California 95812-4025

Jim Hockenberry  
State Water Resources Control Board  
Division of Clean Water Programs  
P.O. Box 944212  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2120

The Honorable Lois Wolk  
Yolo County Board of Supervisors  
625 Court Street, Room 204  
Woodland, CA 95696
LETTER 1:  Terry Roberts, Director, State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research

Response to Comment 1-1

Comment noted. This letter indicates that UC Davis has complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents. Included with the comment letter is a copy of the "Extension of Comment Period," submitted by UC Davis, which gave notice of our extension for the DEIR comment period from February 4, 2002, to February 7, 2002.
January 29, 2002

Mr. Sid England
University of California, Davis
Office of Resource Management and Planning
376 Mrak Hall
One Shields Avenue
Davis, CA 95616

Dear Mr. England:

Re: UC Davis Draft EIR for the Conference Center, Hotel and Graduate School of Management Building Project; SCH# 2001082067

The California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, reviewed the above-referenced document with respect to airport-related noise and safety impacts pursuant to CEQA. The following comments are offered for your consideration.

According to the Draft EIR, the Department of Environmental Horticulture teaching and research field activities currently located on the project site will be relocated to a parcel north of Hutchison Drive near the University Airport. A greenhouse and an agricultural support building will be constructed at the new location. The site is located approximately 1,500 feet northwest of the airport runway. Due to the proximity of the proposed new buildings to the airport, the Federal Aviation Administration, in accordance with Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77, may require a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (enclosed Form 7460-1).

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this proposal. If you have any questions, please call me at (916) 654-5314.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

SANDY HESNARD
Aviation Environmental Planner

Enclosure

c: State Clearinghouse, Dave Boyer-SACOG, Jack Harris-University Airport

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
NOTICE OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OR ALTERATION

§77.13 Construction or alteration requiring notice.
(a) Except as provided in §77.15, each sponsor who proposes any of the following construction or alteration shall notify the Administrator in the form and manner prescribed in §77.17:

(1) Any construction or alteration of more than 200 feet in height above the ground level at its site.

(2) Any construction or alteration of greater height than an imaginary surface extending outward and upward at one of the following slopes:

(i) 100 to 1 for a horizontal distance of 20,000 feet from the nearest point of the nearest runway of each airport specified in paragraph (a) (5) of this section with at least one runway more than 3,200 feet in actual length, excluding heliports.

(ii) 50 to 1 for a horizontal distance of 10,000 feet from the nearest point of the nearest runway of each airport specified in paragraph (a) (5) of this section with its longest runway no more than 3,200 feet in actual length, excluding heliports.

(iii) 25 to 1 for a horizontal distance of 5,000 feet from the nearest point of the nearest landing and takeoff area of each heliport specified in paragraph (a) (5) of this section.

(3) Any highway, railroad, or other traverse way for mobile objects, of a height which, if adjusted upward 17 feet for an Interstate Highway that is part of the National System of Interstate and Interstate Highways where crossings are designed for a minimum of 17 feet vertical distance, 15 feet for any other public roadway, 10 feet or the height of the highest mobile object that would normally traverse the road, whichever is greater, for a private road, 23 feet for a railroad, and for a highway or any other traverse way not previously mentioned, an amount equal to the height of the highest mobile object that would normally traverse it, would exceed a standard of paragraph (a) (1) or (2) of this section.

(4) When requested by the FAA, any construction or alteration that would be in an instrument approach area (defined in the FAA standards governing instrument approach procedures) and available information indicates it might exceed a standard of Subpart C of this part.

(5) Any construction or alteration on any of the following airports (including heliports):

(i) An airport that is available for public use and is listed in the Airport Directory of the current Aeronautic Information Manual or in either the Alaska or Pacific Aeronautic Guide and Chart Supplement.

(ii) An airport under construction, that is the subject of a notice or proposal on file with the Federal Aviation Administration, and except for military airports, it is clearly indicated that airport will be available for public use.

(iii) An airport that is operated by an armed force of the United States.

(b) Each sponsor who proposes construction or alteration that is subject of a notice under paragraph (a) of this section and is advised by an FAA regional office that a supplemental notice is required shall submit that notice on a prescribed form to be received by the FAA regional office at least 46 hours before the start of construction or alteration.

(c) Each sponsor who undertakes construction or alteration that is subject of a notice under paragraph (a) of this section shall, within 5 days after that construction or alteration reaches its greatest height, submit a supplemental notice on a prescribed form to the FAA regional office having jurisdiction over the region involved, if —

(1) The construction or alteration is more than 200 feet above the surface level of its site; or

(2) An FAA regional office advises him that submission of the form is required.

§77.15 Construction or alteration not requiring notice.
No person is required to notify the Administrator for any of the following construction or alteration:

(a) Any object that would be shielded by existing structures of a permanent and substantial character or by natural terrain or topographic features of equal or greater height, and would be located in the congested area of a city, town, or settlement where it is evident beyond all reasonable doubt that the structure so shielded will not adversely affect safety in air navigation.

(b) Any antenna structure of 20 feet or less in height except one that would increase the height of an existing antenna structure.

(c) Any airport navigation facility, airport visual approach or landing aid, aircraft arresting device, or meteorological device, of a type approved by the Administrator, or an appropriate military service on military airports, the location and height of which is fixed by its functional purpose.

(d) Any construction or alteration for which notice is required by any other FAA regulation.

§77.17 Form and time of notice.
(a) Each person who is required to notify the Administrator under §77.13 (a) shall send one executed form set of FAA Form 7460-1, Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration, to the Manager, Air Traffic Division, FAA Regional Office having jurisdiction over the area within which the construction or alteration will be located. Copies of FAA Form 7460-1 may be obtained from the headquarters of the Federal Aviation Administration and the regional offices.

(b) The notice required under §77.13 (a) 1 through (4) must be submitted at least 30 days before the earlier of the following dates —

(1) The date the proposed construction or alteration is to begin.

(2) The date an application for a construction permit is to be filed.

However, a notice relating to proposed construction or alteration that is subject to the licensing requirements of the Federal Communications Act may be sent to the FAA at the same time the application for construction is filed with the Federal Communications Commission, or at any time after that filing.

(c) A proposed structure or an alteration to an existing structure that exceeds 2,000 feet in height above the ground will be presumed to be a hazard to air navigation and to result in an inefficient utilization of airspace and the applicant has the burden of overcoming that presumption. Each notice submitted under the pertinent provisions of this part 77 proposing a structure in excess of 2,000 feet above ground, or an alteration that will make an existing structure exceed that height, must contain a detailed showing, directed to meeting this burden. Only in exceptional cases, where the FAA concludes that a clear and compelling showing has been made that it would not result in an inefficient utilization of the airspace and would not result in a hazard to air navigation, will a determination of no hazard be issued.

(d) In the case of an emergency involving essential public services, public health, or public safety that requires immediate construction or alteration, the 30 day requirement in paragraph (b) of this section does not apply and the notice may be sent by telephone, telegram, or other expeditious means, with an executed FAA Form 7460-1 submitted within five (5) days thereafter. Outside normal business hours, emergency notices by telephone or telegram may be submitted to the nearest FAA Flight Service Station.

(e) Each person who is required to notify the Administrator by paragraph (b) or (c) of §77.13, or both, shall send an executed copy of FAA Form 7460-2, Notice of Actual Construction or Alteration, to the Manager, Air Traffic Division, FAA Regional Office having jurisdiction over the area involved.

ADDRESSES OF THE REGIONAL OFFICES

Eastern Region
DC, DE, MD, NJ, NY, PA, VA, WV
Eastern Regional Office
Air Traffic Division, AEA-520
JFK International Airport
New York, NY 11430
Tel: 718-633-4661

Great Lakes Region
IL, IN, MI, MN, ND, OH, SD, WI
Great Lakes Regional Office
Air Traffic Division, AGL-520
2300 East Davon Avenue
Des Plaines, IL 60018
Tel: 847-294-7568

New England Region
CT, MA, ME, NH, RI, VT
New England Regional Office
Air Traffic Division, ANE-520
2 New England Executive Park
Burlington, MA 01803-5299
Tel: 781-238-7520

Northwest Region
CO, ID, MT, OR, UT, WA, WY
Northwest Mountain Regional Office
Air Traffic Division, ANM-520
1601 Lind Avenue, SW
Renton, WA 98055-4056
Tel. 425-227-2520

Southern Region
AL, FL, GA, KY, MS, NC, PR, SC, TN, VI
Southern Regional Office
Air Traffic Division, ASO-520
1701 Columbia Avenue
College Park, GA 30337
Tel: 404-305-5585

Southwest Region
AR, LA, NM, OK, TX
Southwest Regional Office
Air Traffic Division, ASW-520
2801 Meacham Boulevard
Fort Worth, TX 76137-0520
Tel: 817-222-5531

Western Pacific Region
HI, CA, NV, AZ, GU
Western-Pacific Regional Office
Air Traffic Division, AWP-520
15000 Aviation Boulevard
 Hawthorne, CA 90260
Tel: 310-725-6557

FAA Form 7460-1 (2-99) Supersedes Previous Edition

NSN: 0052-00-012-0009
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING FAA FORM 7460-1

PLEASE TYPE or PRINT

ITEM #1. Please include the name, address, and phone number of a personal contact point as well as the company name.

ITEM #2. Please include the name, address, and phone number of a personal contact point as well as the company name.

ITEM #3. New Construction would be a structure that has not yet been built.
Alteration is a change to an existing structure such as the addition of a side mounted antenna, a change to the marking and lighting, a change to power and/or frequency, or a change to the height. The nature of the alteration shall be included in ITEM #21 "Complete Description of Proposal".
Existing would be a correction to the latitude and/or longitude, a correction to the height, or if filing on an existing structure which has never been studied by the FAA. The reason for the notice shall be included in ITEM #21 "Complete Description of Proposal".

ITEM #4. If Permanent, so indicate. If Temporary, such as a crane or drilling derrick, enter the estimated length of time the temporary structure will be up.

ITEM #5. Enter the date that construction is expected to start and the date that construction should be completed.

ITEM #6. Please indicate the type of structure. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.

ITEM #7. In the event that obstruction marking and lighting is required, please indicate type desired. If no preference, check "other" and indicate "no preference". DO NOT LEAVE BLANK. NOTE: High intensity lighting shall be used only for structures over 500' AGL. In the absence of high intensity lighting for structures over 500' AGL, marking is also required.

ITEM #8. If this is an existing tower that has been registered with the FCC, enter the FCC Antenna Structure Registration number here.

ITEM #9 and #10. Latitude and longitude must be geographic coordinates, accurate to within the nearest second or to the nearest hundredth of a second if known. Latitude and longitude derived solely from a hand-held GPS instrument is NOT acceptable. A hand-held GPS is only accurate to within 100 meters (328 feet) 95 per cent of the time. This data, when plotted, should match the site depiction submitted under ITEM #20.

ITEM #11. NAD 83 is preferred; however, latitude/longitude may be submitted in NAD 27. Also, in some geographic areas where NAD 27 and NAD 83 are not available other datums may be used. It is important to know which datum is used. DO NOT LEAVE BLANK.

ITEM #12. Enter the name of the nearest city/state to the site. If the structure is or will be in a city, enter the name of that city/state.

ITEM #13. Enter the full name of the nearest public-use (not private-use) airport (or heliport) or military airport (or heliport) to the site.

ITEM #14. Enter the distance from the airport or heliport listed in #13 to the structure.

ITEM #15. Enter the direction from the airport or heliport listed in #13 to the structure.

ITEM #16. Enter the site elevation above mean sea level and expressed in whole feet rounded to the nearest foot (e.g. 17’ 3” rounds to 17’, 17” 6” rounds to 18’). This data should match the ground contour elevations for site depiction submitted under ITEM #20.

ITEM #17. Enter the total structure height above ground level in whole feet rounded to the next highest foot (e.g. 17’ 3” rounds to 18’). The total structure height shall include anything mounted on top of the structure, such as antennas, obstruction lights, lightning rods, etc.

ITEM #18. Enter the overall height above mean sea level and expressed in whole feet. This will be the total of ITEM #16 + ITEM #17.

ITEM #19. If an FAA aeronautical study was previously conducted, enter the previous study number.

ITEM #20. Enter the relationship of the structure to roads, airports, prominent terrain, existing structures, etc. Attach an 8-1/2” X 11” non-reduced copy of the appropriate 7.5 minute U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Quadrangle Map MARKED WITH A PRECISE INDICATION OF THE SITE LOCATION. To obtain maps, Contact USGS at 1-800-435-7627 or via Internet at “http://mapping.usgs.gov”. If available, attach a copy of a documented site survey with the surveyor’s certification stating the amount of vertical and horizontal accuracy in feet.

ITEM #21.
- For transmitting stations, include maximum effective radiated power (ERP) and all frequencies.
- For antennas, include the type of antenna and center of radiation (Attach the antenna pattern, if available).
- For microwave, include azimuth relative to true north.
- For overhead wires or transmission lines, include size and configuration of wires and their supporting structures (Attach depiction).
- For each pole/support, include coordinates, site elevation, and structure height above ground level or water.
- For buildings, include site orientation, coordinates of each corner, dimensions, and construction materials.
- For alterations, explain the alteration thoroughly.
- For existing structures, thoroughly explain the reason for notifying the FAA (e.g. corrections, no record of previous study, etc.).

Filing this information with the FAA does not relieve the sponsor of this construction or alteration from complying with any other federal, state or local rules or regulations. If you are not sure what other rules or regulations apply to your proposal, contact local/state aviation and zoning authorities.

Paperwork Reduction Work Act Statement: This information is collected to evaluate the effect of proposed construction or alteration on air navigation and is not confidential. Providing this information is mandatory for anyone proposing construction or alteration that meets or exceeds the criteria contained in 14 CFR, part 77. We estimate that the burden of this collection is an average 19 minutes per response. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The OMB control number for this collection is 2120-0001.
Failure To Provide All Requested Information May Delay Processing of Your Notice

Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration

1. Sponsor (person, company, etc. proposing this action):
   Attn.of: 
   Name: 
   Address: 
   City: ___________________ State: _______ Zip: _______
   Telephone: ____________ Fax: __________

2. Sponsor’s Representative (if other than #1):
   Attn.of: 
   Name: 
   Address: 
   City: ___________________ State: _______ Zip: _______
   Telephone: ____________ Fax: __________

3. Notice of:  
   □ New Construction  □ Alteration  □ Existing
4. Duration:  
   □ Permanent  □ Temporary (______ months, _______ days)
5. Work Schedule:  
   Beginning _________ End _________
6. Type:  
   □ Antenna Tower  □ Crane  □ Building  □ Power Line  
   □ Landfill  □ Water Tank  □ Other _________
7. Marking/Painting and/or Lighting Preferred:
   □ Red Lights and Paint  □ Dual - Red and Medium Intensity White  
   □ White - Medium Intensity  □ Dual - Red and High Intensity White  
   □ White - High Intensity  □ Other _________
8. FCC Antenna Structure Registration Number (if applicable): 

9. Latitude:  
   ___________ o _______' _______" 
10. Longitude:  
   ___________ o _______' _______" 
11. Datum:  
   □ NAD 83  □ NAD 27  □ Other _________
12. Nearest:  
   City: ___________________ State: _______
13. Nearest Public-use (not private-use) or Military Airport or Heliport:

14. Distance from #13 to Structure: _________
15. Direction from #13 to Structure: _________
17. Total Structure Height (AGL): _________ ft.
18. Overall Height (#16 + #17) (AMSL): _________ ft.
19. Previous FAA Aeronautical Study Number (if applicable): _________ OE
20. Description of Location: (Attach a USGS 7.5 minute Quadrangle Map with the precise site marked and any certified survey.)

21. Complete Description of Proposal: 

Notice is required by 14 Code of Federal Regulations, part 77 pursuant to 49 U.S.C., Section 44718. Persons who knowingly and willingly violate the notice requirements of part 77 are subject to a civil penalty of $1,000 per day until the notice is received, pursuant to 49 U.S.C., Section 46301 (a).

I hereby certify that all of the above statements made by me are true, complete, and correct to the best of my knowledge. In addition, I agree to mark and/or light the structure in accordance with established marking & lighting standards as necessary.

Date  _______________  Typed or Printed Name and Title of Person Filing Notice  ___________________  Signature  _______________
LETTER 2:  Sandy Hesnard, Aviation Environmental Planner, California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics

Response to Comment 2-1

Comment noted. The campus will file the appropriate notice if required by Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77.
February 3, 2002

01YOL0083
SCH #2001082067:
UC Davis Conference Center, Hotel &
University Relations Building
DEIR
03YOL080 PM 0.001

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

Dear Mr. Meyer:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the UC Davis Conference Center, Hotel and
University Relations Building. Our comments are as follows

- The traffic study is inadequate. Ramp junction operations and conditions were only
  analyzed under “Nonevent” conditions, including ramps along Interstate 80 and State
  Route 113. The traffic study should also address “Event” conditions. For example, the
  report anticipates that 75% of the “Event” traffic will use Old Davis Road Interchange
  (page 4.3-14).

Please provide Caltrans with a revised traffic study including “event” traffic impacts. If you
have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Rebecca Covington at (916)-
322-0579.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY PULVERMAN, Chief
Office of Regional Planning

“Caltrans improves mobility across California”
LETTER 3: Jeffrey Pulverman, Chief, Office of Regional Planning, California Department of Transportation, District 3

Response to Comment 3-1

In response to the commenter's concern expressed in this letter, a campus representative contacted Rebecca Covington at the California Department of Transportation and was referred to Teresa Limon, Traffic Operations engineer. The campus provided Ms. Limon with the information provided in this response (see below) that presents operating conditions for freeway ramp junctions in the vicinity of the project during a.m. and p.m. peak hours under conference center event conditions. In addition, upon her request, the campus provided Ms. Limon with backup calculations used in this assessment (available during normal office hours at the Office of Resource Management and Planning in 376 Mrak Hall on the UC Davis campus) and provided Ms. Limon explanations in response to her questions. In response, as shown on the attached email printout, Ms. Limon replied that her comments had been addressed.

Section 4.3 of the DEIR addressed freeway ramp junction operating conditions during non-event conditions (normal operations of the conference center and hotel) for existing plus project and year 2022 traffic volumes.

The commenter has requested analysis of freeway ramp junctions based upon “event” conditions. Tables 1 through 4 present the results of the requested analysis. Under event 1 and event 2 conditions, the resultant roadway operating conditions are level of service “C” or better. Therefore, acceptable operating conditions are anticipated at these locations, and the traffic impact at these locations is less than significant.
### TABLE 1
**PEAK HOUR FREEWAY RAMP JUNCTION OPERATING CONDITIONS**
**BASELINE CONDITIONS – A.M. PEAK HOUR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainline</th>
<th>Ramp</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project Non-Event</th>
<th>With Project Event 1</th>
<th>With Project Event 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Density¹</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Density¹</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Road</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Road</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp to SR</td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp from</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Road</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Road</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Passenger cars per mile per lane.


### TABLE 2
**PEAK HOUR 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>
<th>With Project Event 1</th>
<th>With Project Event 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Density¹</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Density¹</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Road</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Road</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp to SR</td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp from</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Road</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 113</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Passenger cars per mile per lane.

### TABLE 3
PEAK HOUR 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>
<th>With Project Event 1</th>
<th>With Project Event 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Density¹</td>
<td>LOS</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>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.79</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>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp to SR 113</td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.11</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 Road</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Passenger cars per mile per lane.

### TABLE 4
PEAK HOUR FREEWAY RAMP JUNCTION OPERATING CONDITIONS
YEAR 2022 CONDITIONS – P.M. PEAK HOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainline</th>
<th>Ramp</th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project Non-Event</th>
<th>With Project Event 1</th>
<th>With Project Event 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Density¹</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Density¹</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-80 Eastbound</td>
<td>Exit to Old Davis Road</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</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 Road</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entrance from Old Davis Road</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 Davis Road</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 Road</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Passenger cars per mile per lane.
Sarah,

My comments have been addressed. Could I have a final copy of the traffic study for our files. Thank you.
January 22, 2002

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

Subject: Notice of Completion of Draft EIR – Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building Project.

Dear Mr. Meyer,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the University’s proposed Conference Center, Hotel, and Graduate School of Management Building Project. The county staff have reviewed the draft EIR document (w/appendices) and have determined that there are no direct and/or significant impacts of concern to the county as a result of these proposed projects. However, the county does submit the following comments regarding the residual and cumulative impacts to county facilities and services.

• (4.3) Transportation – While the Level of Service (LOS) levels for affected county roads or intersections do not exceed standards with the proposed projects, the full build-out of the University’s Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) could have cumulative impacts to the county road system. Therefore, UCD should partner with the county in actively pursuing a complimentary and comprehensive maintenance program to insure the safe linkages that the primary county roads provide to meet the expanded needs of the campus (i.e., approx. 375 new employees based on the current project, and increasing with full LRDP build-out).

• (4.5) Biological Resources – The proposed projects are estimated to result in the conversion of agricultural land-cropland habitat, which would result in the loss of potential foraging habitat for the Swainson’s Hawk and other resident and migratory species. More importantly, it is estimated that the full build-out of the amended LRDP would contribute to the regional loss of 1,258 acres of agricultural land habitat for Swainson’s Hawk and other resident and migratory birds. Representatives of UCD have participated in the discussions regarding the development of the County’s Habitat Conservation Plan as members of the Gaining Ground Committee. The County’s HCP/NCCP program represents a partnership of all the entities within the county including UCD, to promote an effective and comprehensive habitat mitigation program for development. Therefore, UCD could have a significant role with the extent of its proposed development and the success of the County HCP’s goals for the strategic placement of sensitive habitat lands under protection.
• (5.1) Growth Inducing Impacts – Under CEQA, the issue of growth inducement is detrimental, largely within the context that the impacted entity is not able to provide adequate levels of services or that the anticipated growth will result in a significant environmental impact. The proposed projects may, and clearly the full build-out of the Campus LRDP will undoubtedly serve as a stimulus for growth in the surrounding communities and the county.

While the expansion of the UCD campus is largely viewed as necessary and seemingly supported by the neighboring entities, it is important that the University partner with the county to help fund the increased demands for services (i.e., public health, mental health, public guardian, probation, sheriff and animal services).

• Air Quality – The Campus is located within the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District, that is a nonattainment zone for State and Federal standards for ozone (\(O_3\)) and for particulate matter (PM\(_{10}\)). However, in review of the Initial Study Checklist for these projects the air quality impacts were determined not to exceed the thresholds of the analysis addressed within the prior EIR for the LRDP. The implementation of the LRDP was determined to result in cumulative air quality impacts that were significant and unavoidable. Effective land use planning can be a major factor in minimizing air quality impacts, and, as such, UCD staff should continue their efforts to develop student and faculty high-density housing located on or within proximity to the campus to promote multi-modal pedestrian modes of transportation. Additionally, the University should work in cooperation with the neighboring cities within the county, to the extent, that the entities can help to provide the community linkages and much needed additional housing development for UCD faculty and employees.

In closing, the Yolo County Board of Supervisors has long demonstrated their steadfast support of the University’s Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). The County also recognizes and appreciates the need for the UCD Campus to respond to the demands for expanded academic programs, research facilities, and in maintaining its role as a catalyst for progress within Yolo County and the region.

If there are any questions regarding the issues discussed in this letter, please contact John Bencomo, Director of Planning and Public Works, at (530) 666-8045 or by e-mail at john.bencomo@ccm.yolocounty.org. Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Dave Rosenberg, Chairman
Yolo County Board of Supervisors
LETTER 4: Dave Rosenberg, Chairman, Yolo County Board of Supervisors

Response to Comment 4-1

Comment noted. Please see Responses to Comments 4-2 through 4-7.

Response to Comment 4-2

Cumulative impacts of buildout of the 1994 LRDP, including the proposed project, are addressed on pages 4.3-25 through 4.3-41 of the DEIR. With buildout of the 1994 LRDP, the proposed project (even under event conditions) would not result in a level of service exceedance on any County roadway. In addition, the proposed hotel would pay 8 percent of its gross revenue for County of Yolo Transient Occupancy Tax, which, along with other taxes generated by campus activities, would contribute to the County revenue that could be used for services including road maintenance.

As discussed on pages 4.3-26 and 4.3-28 of the DEIR, 1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.3-1(a) provides for the campus’ active involvement in a transportation demand management program, which implements strategies to reduce reliance on travel to and from campus by private automobiles. Such strategies include those that would help reduce travel on county roads, such as increased parking fees, transit planning and subsidies, carpool and vanpool matching services and incentive programs, public awareness programs, park and ride identification, and telecommuting. Furthermore, UC Davis is represented on the Yolo County Transportation District Board.

Response to Comment 4-3

The commenter is correct that implementation of the proposed project would result in the loss of approximately two acres of potential Swainson’s hawk foraging habitat and that cumulative impacts identified in the 1994 LRDP, as amended, could result in the loss of 1,258 acres of agricultural and habitat. The project-specific loss would be compensated for by redesignating approximately two acres designated for development under the 1994 LRDP to Teaching and Research Fields (see Mitigation Measure 4.5-1 on page 4.5-5 of the DEIR). Cumulative impacts due to campus growth under the 1994 LRDP would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level by establishing new habitat at the Russell Ranch (1994 LRDP EIR Mitigation Measure 4.7-5). The California Department of Fish and Game has determined that this mitigation will reduce impacts to Swainson's hawk to a less-than-significant level (see the discussion under Impact 4.5-2 on pages 4.5-5 through 4.5-8).

The cumulative loss of agricultural land habitat in the region was considered a significant and unavoidable impact because the feasibility and/or implementation of mitigation measures cannot be guaranteed by the University of California because they fall within other jurisdictions to enforce and monitor. As discussed on page 4.5-7 of the DEIR, the proposed project, in conjunction with cumulative growth under the 1994 LRDP and in the region, would contribute to the cumulative loss of agricultural land and habitat. The commenter is correct that the campus is participating in the County's Habitat Conservation Plan discussions and is looking for opportunities to maximize the benefits of regional habitat management efforts for special status species including Swainson's hawk.
Response to Comment 4-4

Section 5.1, Growth-Inducing Impacts, of the DEIR addresses the relationship of the proposed project to the 1994 LRDP population projections and the potential of the project to indirectly stimulate growth by the provision of improved infrastructure. As summarized on page 5.1-3, even though the proposed project would result in an increase in population and infrastructure improvements, the 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 assumed in the 1994 LRDP and fully evaluated in the 1994 LRDP EIR.

Growth in jurisdictions surrounding the campus (i.e., the City of Davis, Yolo and Solano Counties) is under the jurisdiction of the City and counties and is guided by their respective General Plans. 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 of local jurisdictions through implementation of the next LRDP. The campus has already convened a working group representing the City of Davis, Solano and Yolo Counties, and the Davis Joint Unified School District that is specifically designed to identify and address increased demands on local services resulting from campus growth through the next LRDP.

The proposed hotel would pay 8 percent of its gross revenue for County of Yolo Transient Occupancy Tax, which, along with other taxes generated by campus activities, would contribute to the County revenue that could be used for services including public and mental health, public guardian, probation, sheriff, and animal services. Retail sales on campus are the largest source of sales tax revenues for Yolo County. As the campus grows, this revenue stream will likely grow as well.

Response to Comment 4-5

Comment noted. As discussed further in Appendix D of the DEIR (Cumulative Impacts Analysis - Focus on Potential Environmental Effects Associated with Projected Student Enrollment Increases through 2014-15), the campus is currently considering how it should plan to accommodate its share of the University's enrollment growth beyond the 1994 LRDP. The campus is evaluating the option of establishing housing on-campus that would accommodate from 25 to 100 percent of the student growth and a large portion of the faculty and staff anticipated beyond the current LRDP. Development of housing near the campus would help reduce traffic and associated vehicle emissions. The campus is meeting regularly with local government jurisdictions (including the Counties of Yolo and Solano, the City of Davis, and the Davis Joint Unified School District) as the new LRDP is developed.

Response to Comment 4-6

Comment noted.