

2.0 SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This section briefly describes the project under consideration, alternatives to the proposed project, areas of controversy, and direct and indirect project impacts. All impacts and mitigation measures that were identified during the course of this environmental analysis are presented in **Table 2.0-2** at the end of this chapter.

PROJECT UNDER REVIEW

The Mishka's Café Project (Proposed Project) would demolish the existing Tank House structure and remaining orange trees at 604 Second Street to accommodate the construction of a new three-story, approximately 5,000 square foot (sf) commercial building between the Varsity Theater and the Dresbach-Hunt-Boyer Mansion (Mansion). The mixed-use commercial building would include a 1,776 sf ground floor café with outdoor seating, with 3,224 sf of office space on the second and third floors. The building would directly abut the Varsity Theater and would be flush with the Second Street sidewalk. A small patio space enclosed with wrought iron fencing would be located on the west side, providing an 11 foot setback from the existing brick pathway for approximately 27 feet until the proposed building widens, reducing the setback from the Mansion's bow window to seven feet at its narrowest point. The building would be 31 feet 6 inches in height for the length of the property, with a 10 foot deep deck on the third floor.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The following six alternatives are analyzed in this EIR at an equal level of analysis:

- ***Alternative 1: No Project/No Development Alternative***
The No Project/No Development Alternative assumes that the Proposed Project would not occur and there would be no new development of the site. This alternative assumes the Tank House would be left in its present location and in its existing condition. Minimal activities to secure the building and minimize further deterioration, such as sealing the structure in a plastic wrapping, would be provided by the City.
- ***Alternative 2: Disassemble/Reassemble and Rehabilitate the Tank House and Construct New Three-Story Building***
Alternative 2 would construct a three-story building identical to the Proposed Project. Rather than demolishing the Tank House, Alternative 2 would disassemble, reassemble, and rehabilitate the Tank House on the west side of the Mansion near the corner of E and Second streets. The Tank House could be reused either for public use such as a visitor/community information kiosk or as a small private retail shop (i.e. flower or produce stand), or as a support use/function to the primary uses in the Mansion. The walkways and landscape areas around the Tank House would be improved to complement the Tank House use, provide public seating areas, and enhance the entrance to the Mansion Square complex to the south.

- **Alternative 3: Disassemble/Reassemble and Rehabilitate the Tank House and Construct New Two-Story Building**

Alternative 3 would construct a new approximately 2,920 sf two-story building between the Varsity Theater and the Mansion, remove the remaining orange trees, and disassemble, reassemble, and rehabilitate the Tank House on the west side of the Mansion for potential public use as a visitor information kiosk or private commercial use. The relocation and rehabilitation would be as described above in Alternative 2. The new commercial building would include a 1,670 sf ground floor café and a 1,250 sf second floor office with a 420 sf roof deck. The second floor would be stepped back to maintain full visibility of the Varsity's neon marquee.

- **Alternative 4: Demolish the Tank House and Construct New Two-Story Building**

Alternative 4 would construct a new approximately 2,920 sf two-story building identical to that described in Alternative 3, above. However, Alternative 4 assumes demolition of the Tank House.

- **Alternative 5: Disassemble/Reassemble and Rehabilitate the Tank House with Greenhouse-Type Addition Alternative**

Alternative 5 would construct a 739 sf, wood frame greenhouse-type addition to the Tank House, and disassemble the Tank House and relocate and reassemble/rehabilitate it approximately 9 feet west and 4 feet north of its current location, abutting the existing brick walkway at approximately 6 feet, 9½ inches from the Mansion's bow window. The Tank House would be used as an operational "kitchen" for a café, connecting through an enclosed passage through a new opening on the eastern wall to the greenhouse addition along the Varsity wall to provide additional seating, a unisex restroom, and storage. Five out of ten orange trees would be removed.

- **Alternative 6: Disassemble/Reassemble and Rehabilitate In Situ Alternative**

Alternative 6 would disassemble/reassemble and rehabilitate the Tank House in its present location for commercial or public use. Reuse options under this alternative could include a visitor/public information kiosk run by the City or other non-profit entity. Other possibilities include trying to attract a private business to operate a small retail or café use out of the rehabilitated Tank House. Under either public or commercial reuse options for this alternative, the brick patio and orange tree grove would be maintained and enhanced as an outdoor seating space

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Alternative 6, Disassemble/Reassemble, and Rehabilitate the Tank House In-Situ, would be the environmentally superior alternative. This alternative would eliminate significant impacts on the Tank House, Landmark-eligible trees, and historic setting of the Mansion complex, and would address health and safety issues as well as visual impacts. There would be no significant environmental issues associated with this alternative, and it would meet some of the project objectives. It could somewhat increase the vitality on the block and surrounding area by providing for public use of the site, it would be a project that is compatible with the adjacent historic resources, and it would remedy an unsafe public building for the protection of public health and safety. Alternative 6 would meet adopted historic conservation goals and policies, but would meet few Downtown Core Commercial goals and policies, and would likely fail to meet the project objective of an economically viable project that generates direct and indirect net fiscal benefit to the city.

COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

Each of the alternatives is analyzed at an equal level of analysis in Chapter 5. **Table 2.0-1** provides a summary comparison of the severity of impacts for each alternative.

**TABLE 2.0-1
COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE MITIGATED PROPOSED PROJECT**

Significant Impacts	PP	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6
Impact 5.1-1: Consistency with adopted plans and policies	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No Yes
Impact 5.1-2: Impacts on the Downtown Core Commercial Area visual context	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 5.1-3: Inconsistency with design guidelines and incompatibility of materials and design with the immediate context	SU	LS	SU	LS	LS	RE	LS
Impact 5.1-4: Impact on Landmark Trees and Trees of Significance	SU	LS	SU	SU	SU	SU RE	LS
Impact 5.2-1: Loss or degradation of known or undiscovered prehistoric and historic resources	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS
Impact 5.2-2: Alteration, removal, or destruction of historic resources	SU	LS	LS	LS	SU	RE	LS
Impact 5.2-3: Loss or alteration of the historic setting of a National Register Property	SU	LS	SU	SU	SU	LS	LS
Impact 5.2-4: Cumulative loss of cultural resources	SU	LS	RE	RE	SU	RE	LS
Impact 5.2-5: Cumulative impact on preliminarily identified historic district	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS	LS

Notes: SU= Significant and Unavoidable, LS= Less-than-significant, RE = Level of significance is reduced compared to the Proposed Project, but remains significant and unavoidable.

Source: Gail Ervin Consulting, 2007

POTENTIAL AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

CEQA Guidelines Section 15123 specifies that the summary shall identify “areas of controversy” known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public, and issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate the significant effects.

The Proposed Project involves a site that is governed by competing goals and objectives. On the one hand, the site is within the Downtown Commercial Core, adjacent to the California Register-eligible Varsity Theater, which the Redevelopment Agency and the City have committed to supporting through commercial revitalization of the area. Adopted plans and policies promote infill development, commercial uses, and increased intensity of development in the Core. On the other hand, the proposed site itself, although featuring a condemned building, contains contributing resources to, and is a part of, the historic setting of the Mansion, a National Register property. Adopted conservation goals and policies promote preservation, adaptive reuse, and sensitive handling of listed historic properties.

Development involving historic properties is generally controversial and difficult to assess. Historic preservation is very subjective, based on guidance and interpretation rather than clear-cut rules and regulations. What constitutes a “material” or “significant” loss of historic fabric or context to one preservation expert, let alone the local public, may be less than significant to another. In addition, perceptions of what is important to a community vary widely amongst its citizens.

Specifically, there is both professional and public disagreement regarding the eligibility of the remaining 10 orange trees on the site, originally part of a larger orchard, as a contributing resource to the historic context of the Dresbach-Hunt-Boyer Mansion. The City Arborist has indicated it is also unclear whether the 100-year old trees are, or were supposed to be, designated Landmark Trees; although they are noted on the City’s web list of Landmark Trees, there is no supporting written documentation for the listing. For purposes of this EIR analysis, the trees are considered eligible for listing as Landmark Trees, and a potentially contributing resource to the historic setting of the Mansion. Therefore, loss of any orange trees would be a significant adverse impact.

There have also been comments on the Notice of Preparation regarding the open space on the site. Some noted the open space is valuable in and of itself; most commented on its value as part of the historic setting of the Mansion. There are no references to the site as open space in any adopted plan or policy. Furthermore, adopted plans and policies for the Core Area refer to the value of private open space such as patios and balconies for the commercial core (Core Area Specific Plan section 4.2(c)). Therefore, for purposes of this EIR analysis, the open space discussion focuses on the potential loss of the historic setting of a National Register property. Alternatives 5 and 6 ~~were was~~ designed to preserve the existing setting.

This EIR also relies on the report prepared by Roland-Nawi Associates regarding the previous placement of the water tank inside the Tank House structure. Valerie Vann submitted additional historic research (Appendix E) that indicates the water tank may have been placed on the exterior of the Tank House.

The placement of the elevated water storage tank is not known. It is possible that it was external and exposed to view, but there is no definitive evidence at this time to adequately document this possibility. The *Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Historic Preservation* require that missing elements of a building or structure be well documented. Such documentation must consist of drawings, plans, photographs, or substantial physical remains, such that the actual historic appearance of the missing element is clearly understood and can be accurately reproduced. The *Secretary’s Standards* specifically preclude the introduction of elements based on conjecture or designs “typical” of the time or building/structure type. Such replacements may actually impair the integrity of the remaining historic building/structure. If a project alternative that rehabilitates the tank house is adopted in lieu of the Proposed Project, this rehabilitation issue will be further discussed and final rehabilitation plans determined in consultation with the Historic Resources Management Commission to meet the *Secretary’s Standards*.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

As listed in **Table 2.0-2** at the end of this chapter, this EIR discusses impacts of the Proposed Project and six alternatives at an equal level of analysis, and provides mitigation

measures where feasible. These impacts were identified as 1) less-than-significant, which requires no mitigation, 2) significant, where mitigation measures are provided to reduce impacts to less-than-significant, or 3) significant and unavoidable, where either no mitigation is available or mitigation measures can reduce the magnitude but not lower an impact to less than significant. These impacts are analyzed in Chapter 5.0, Environmental Analysis, in the following sub-chapters:

- Sub-Chapter 5.1 Land Use and Aesthetics
- Sub-Chapter 5.2 Cultural and Historic Resources

A significant effect on the environment is defined by California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance (CEQA Guidelines Section 15382). Implementation of the Proposed Project or the alternatives would result in significant impacts to some of these resources, which are fully analyzed in sub-chapters 5.1 and 5.2 of this document and are summarized in Table 2.0-2, below.

This EIR discusses mitigation measures that could be implemented by the Agency, the City, and/or the project applicant to reduce potential adverse impacts to a level that is considered less-than-significant. Such mitigation measures are noted in this document and are found in the sub-chapters.

SUMMARY TABLE

Table 2.0-2 (Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures) has been organized to correspond with the environmental issues discussed in Chapter 5. The summary table is arranged in four columns:

- Impact Category (Analysis Chapter)
- Potential Environmental Impacts (Impact and Significance Before Mitigation)
- Mitigation measures (Mitigation Measure)
- The level of significance after implementation of mitigation measures (Residual Significance)

If an impact is determined to be significant or potentially significant, mitigation measures are identified, where appropriate and feasible. More than one mitigation measure may be required to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. This EIR assumes that all applicable plans, policies, and regulations would be implemented, including, but not necessarily limited to, City of Davis General Plan, the Core Area Specific Plan, the Core Area Strategy Report and Five-Year Action Plan, the Design Guidelines, the Davis Redevelopment Plan and 2003-2008 Five-Year Implementation Plan, and the Zoning Regulations. Applicable plans, policies, and regulations are identified and described in the Regulatory Setting of each issue area and within the relevant impact analysis. A description of the organization of the environmental analysis, as well as key foundational assumptions regarding the approach to the analysis, is provided in Chapter 5.0 (Introduction to the Analysis).

**TABLE 2.0-2
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Impact Category	Potential Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
Land Use and Aesthetics	<p>Impact 5.1-1: Consistency with adopted plans and policies</p> <p>PP The Proposed Project would be consistent with most adopted goals and policies.</p> <p>A1 The No Project Alternative would be inconsistent with most adopted goals and policies.</p> <p>A2 Alternative 2 would be inconsistent with key urban design and conservation goals and policies to protect historic resources in the Downtown Core.</p> <p>A3 Alternative 3 would overall be consistent with adopted goals and policies.</p> <p>A4 Alternative 4 would be inconsistent with key conservation goals and policies to protect historic resources in the Downtown Core.</p> <p>A5 Alternative 5 would be generally inconsistent the Secretary's Standards and with most Downtown Core goals and policies.</p> <p>A6 Alternative 6 would be generally inconsistent with most adopted goals and policies for the downtown commercial core regarding mixed uses and intensification of uses, although consistent with key preservation and open space goals and policies.</p>	Not applicable to findings of consistency	<p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Consistent</p> <p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Inconsistent</p> <p>Consistent</p> <p>Inconsistent</p> <p><u>Generally Inconsistent</u></p> <p>Inconsistent</p> <p><u>Consistent</u></p>
Land Use and Aesthetics	<p>Impact 5.1-2: Impacts on the Downtown Core Commercial Area visual context</p> <p>PP The Proposed Project would substantially alter and intensify development of the project site. Although infill use of the Tank House site would alter the historic open space between the Mansion and the Varsity Theater, this would not constitute a substantial change in the visual</p>	None Required	Less than significant

Impact Category	Potential Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	<p>context of the Downtown Core Commercial area, and would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>A1 The No Project Alternative would stabilize the Tank House in situ and result in no change in the current visual context of the site.</p> <p>A2 Alternative 2 would result in effects similar to the Proposed Project, and would result in a less-than-significant impact on the Downtown Core Commercial visual context.</p> <p>A3 Alternative 3 would further fill in the commercial “row” streetscape context, consistent with the surrounding commercial area. This would result in a less-than-significant impact on the Downtown Core Commercial visual context.</p> <p>A4 Alternative 4 would result in effects similar to A3, and would result in a less-than-significant impact on the Downtown Core Commercial visual context.</p> <p>A5 Alternative 5 would maintain the Tank House in active service and provide some street level pedestrian activity, thus would result in a less-than-significant impact on the Downtown Core Commercial visual context.</p> <p>A6 Alternative 6 would rehabilitate the Tank House in situ and would have a less-than-significant impact on the Downtown Core Commercial visual context.</p>		
<p>Land Use and Aesthetics</p>	<p>Impact 5.1-3: Inconsistency with design guidelines and incompatibility of materials and design with the immediate context</p> <p>PP The Proposed Project would result in an incompatible design, and have a significant impact on the immediate visual context.</p> <p>A1 The No Project Alternative would stabilize the Tank House in situ and preserve the orange trees on site. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation other than an alternative building design would provide compliance with the design guidelines and mitigate impacts to the immediate historic context of the site.</p> <p>None required</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Less than Significant</p>

Impact Category	Potential Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	<p>A2 Alternative 2 would be identical to the Proposed Project, except for the rehabilitation of the Tank House and would have a <i>significant impact</i> on the immediate visual context.</p> <p>A3 Alternative 3 would have a <i>less-than-significant impact</i> on the immediate visual context.</p> <p>A4 The design of Alternative 4 would be identical to Alternative 3, and would have a <i>less-than-significant impact</i> on the immediate visual context.</p> <p>A5 Alternative 5 materials and design would be incompatible with the Tank House and the adjacent Landmark buildings, and it would result in a <i>significant impact</i> on the immediate context.</p> <p>A6 Alternative 6 would have a <i>less-than-significant impact</i> on the immediate context.</p>	<p>No mitigation other than an alternative building design would provide compliance with the design guidelines and mitigate impacts to the immediate historic context of the site.</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None required</p> <p>No mitigation other than an alternative building design would provide compliance with the design guidelines and mitigate impacts to the immediate historic context of the site.</p> <p>None required</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Less than Significant</p> <p>Less than Significant</p> <p>Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Less than Significant</p>
Land Use and Aesthetics	<p>Impact 5.1-4: Impact on Landmark Trees and Trees of Significance</p> <p>PP The Proposed Project would remove 10 orange trees eligible for listing as Landmark trees, a significant impact.</p> <p>A1 The No Project Alternative would preserve the orange trees on site, causing a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>A2 Alternative 2 would remove 10 orange trees eligible for listing as Landmark trees, a significant impact.</p> <p>A3 Alternative 3 would remove 10 orange trees eligible for listing as Landmark trees, a significant impact.</p> <p>A4 Alternative 4 would remove 10 orange trees eligible for</p>	<p>There are no mitigation measures beyond redesigning any new construction around the orange trees.</p> <p>None required</p> <p>There are no mitigation measures beyond redesigning any new construction around the orange trees.</p> <p>There are no mitigation measures beyond redesigning any new construction around the orange trees.</p> <p>There are no mitigation measures beyond redesigning any new construction around the orange trees.</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Less than Significant</p> <p>Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Significant and unavoidable</p>

Impact Category	Potential Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	<p>listing as Landmark trees, a significant impact.</p> <p>A5 Alternative 5 would remove 5 of 10 orange trees eligible for listing as Landmark trees, a significant impact.</p> <p>A6 Alternative 6 would preserve the orange trees on site. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>There are no mitigation measures beyond redesigning any new construction around the orange trees.</p> <p>None required</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Cultural and Historic Resources</p>	<p>Impact 5.2-1 Loss or degradation of known or undiscovered prehistoric and historic resources</p> <p>PP The Proposed Project would demolish the Tank House and 10 historic orange trees, contributing resources to the listed Dresbach-Hunt-Boyer Mansion, and would trench for foundation and utilities for a new three-story building. This would be a significant impact.</p> <p>A1 The No Project Alternative would stabilize the Tank House in situ, and would result in no trenching on the property. If a new foundation is required to stabilize the Tank House to keep it from falling into the Mansion, trenching for the foundation would be a potentially significant impact.</p> <p>A2 Alternative 2 would disassemble, reassemble, and rehabilitate the Tank House to the west side of the Mansion, remove the contributing 10 historic orange trees, and would trench for foundations and utilities on both sides of the Mansion for a new three-story building and adaptive reuse of the Tank House. This would be a significant impact.</p> <p>A3 Alternative 3 would disassemble, reassemble, and rehabilitate the Tank House to the west side of the Mansion, remove the contributing 10 historic orange trees, and would trench for foundations and utilities on both sides of the Mansion for a new two-story building and adaptive reuse of the Tank House. This would be a significant impact.</p>	<p>The following measure applies to the PP and all alternatives:</p> <p>5.2-1a: The Agency shall hire a qualified professional to formulate and implement a research design and field strategy with regard to possible sub-surface resources. Testing shall include geophysical mapping of the near surface, ground-truthing using both the geophysical maps and historic maps, followed by evaluation of discovered resources for CRHR eligibility. All testing shall be conducted prior to initiation of construction for the project. Based on the results of testing, recommendations shall be provided, which may include additional testing, data recovery, future construction monitoring, as well as preparation of an Unanticipated Discovery Plan. All recommendations shall be submitted to the City of Davis Preservation Director for approval.</p> <p>5.2-1b: The Agency shall hire a professional archaeologist to perform archaeological monitoring during ground-disturbing construction activities for the duration of the project. If resources are discovered during construction, the procedure laid out in the Unanticipated Discovery Plan will be followed.</p> <p>5.2-1c If significant findings are made, historic materials and artifacts shall be incorporated into an interpretive display in the proposed building, or grouped with other projects to produce a larger</p>	<p>Less than significant</p>

Impact Category	Potential Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	<p>A4 Alternative 4 would demolish the Tank House and 10 historic orange trees, contributing resources to the listed Dresbach-Hunt-Boyer Mansion, and would trench for foundation and utilities for a new two-story building. This would be a significant impact.</p> <p>A5 Alternative 5 would trench for foundation and utilities for a relocated and rehabilitated Tank House with greenhouse-type addition, and remove five orange trees. This would be a significant impact.</p> <p>A6 Alternative 6 would trench for a new foundation and utilities for a rehabilitated Tank House. This would be a significant impact.</p>	<p>more comprehensive exhibit or display in coordination with the Historic Resources Management Commission (HRMC). The interpretive display shall include a history of the site uses including information on the various ethnic groups that dominated the site. Display of all historic materials and artifacts shall follow the standard practices and procedures generally accepted in museum curation, and shall be made available to the HRMC for review and comment before they are constructed and installed. All collected materials shall be archived at an appropriate curation facility.</p> <p>5.2-1d All activities related to the data recovery of the site shall be recorded and compiled into a report and submitted to both the HRMC, the North Central Information Center, and SHPO. In addition, appropriate public outreach material such as a leaflet, pamphlet, or booklet shall be developed detailing any finds and their historic context. All reports shall be deposited with the city's archive and shall include original photographs and negatives or high resolution digital scans in a TIF format on high quality CD's or DVD's. Reports if produced in a digital format shall be deposited as both a hard copy and a digital copy. A release shall be included that allows the archive the right to reproduce all documents and graphics (including photographs) without restriction.</p>	
Cultural and Historic Resources	<p>Impact 5.2-2 Alteration, removal, or destruction of historic structures</p> <p>PP The PP would cause the demolition of the Tank House, a listed contributing structure to a National Register property, which would result in a significant impact.</p> <p>A1 The method of stabilization that would be used to halt the structural deterioration and ensure the structure does not</p>	<p>The following applies to the PP and all alternatives:</p> <p>5.2-2a The Tank House shall be recorded to Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) standards prior to demolition and/or disassembly. Copies of the HABS/HAER documentation shall be filed with the State Office of Historic Preservation, the Hattie</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Less than significant</p>

Impact Category	Potential Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	<p>collapse onto the Mansion is not known at this time. Therefore, the impact on historic resources would be potentially significant.</p> <p>A2 Alternative 2 would disassemble the Tank House, then reassemble and rehabilitate it on the west side of the Mansion, and would result in a less-than-significant impact on historic structures.</p> <p>A3 Alternative 3 would disassemble the Tank House, then reassemble and rehabilitate it on the west side of the Mansion, and would result in a less-than-significant impact on historic structures.</p> <p>A4 Alternative 4, while similar to Alternative 3, would cause the demolition of the Tank House. This would be a significant impact.</p> <p>A5 Alternative 5 would cause the alteration of the Tank House in a manner inconsistent with the Secretary's Standards, which would result in a significant impact.</p> <p>A6 Alternative 6 would disassemble, reassemble, and rehabilitate the Tank House in its current location, which would have a less-than-significant impact.</p>	<p>Weber Museum, and the City of Davis. HABS/HAER recordation typically includes the following:</p> <p>The development of site-specific history and appropriate contextual information regarding the particular resource. In addition to archival research and comparative studies, this task could involve limited oral history collection.</p> <p>Accurate mapping of the resources, scaled to indicate size and proportion of the structures.</p> <p>Photo documentation of the designated resources, both in still and video formats.</p> <p>Recordation by measured architectural drawings, in the case of specifically designed structures of high architectural merit; "as-built" plans of existing structures/foundation ruins will involve field measurements, office scaled plan layout, and plot out of final plan.</p> <p><u>5.2-2b An interpretive display shall be developed in the Dresbach Hunt Boyer Mansion or other appropriate location on site, in coordination with the Historic Resources Management Commission (HRMC). The interpretive display shall include a history of the property and residents and may contain samples of historic materials, models showing methods of construction, and educational material describing the use and relationship of the site's auxiliary structures to the residence. The display(s) shall be made available to the HRMC for review and comment before they are constructed and installed.</u></p> <p><u>5.2-2c Appropriate public outreach material such as a leaflet, pamphlet, or booklet shall be developed detailing the history of the structures and site, their development and alteration over time, place in the history of sustainable resource use, and context in the town's cultural, environmental and political history. All reports and public outreach materials</u></p>	<p>Less than significant</p> <p>Less than significant</p> <p>Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Less than significant</p>

Impact Category	Potential Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
Cultural and Historic Resources	<p>Impact 5.2-3 Loss or alteration of the historic setting of a National Register Property</p> <p>PP The placement of a building of the proposed height and massing in the proposed location will further reduce the open space around the Mansion, resulting in a significant impact on the historic setting, even though it would not remove the Mansion from the National Register.</p> <p>A1 Alternative 1 would result in no change in open space on the site. The Tank House would be stabilized and the orange trees would remain, resulting in no change in the setting. This would be a less-than-significant impact.</p> <p>A2 Alternative 2 would be identical to the Proposed Project, except that the Tank House would be relocated. Although the Tank House would remain in a historic context with the Mansion, removal of the orange trees and loss of open space around the Mansion would result</p>	<p><u>shall be deposited with the city's archive and the Hattie Weber Museum, and shall include original photographs and negatives or high resolution digital scans in a TIF format on high quality CD's or DVD's. Reports and other materials if produced in a digital format shall be deposited as both a hard copy and a digital copy. A release shall be included that allows the archive and museum the right to reproduce all documents and graphics (including photographs) without restriction.</u></p> <p>The following measure applies to alternatives A1, A2, A3, A5, and A6:</p> <p><u>5.2-2db The Secretary's Standards shall be applied to stabilization, disassembly, reassembly, and rehabilitation of the Tank House to ensure that treatments will maintain the authenticity and integrity of historical features.</u></p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Less than significant</p> <p>Significant and unavoidable</p>

Impact Category	Potential Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	<p>in a significant impact on the historic setting, even though it would not remove the Mansion from the National Register.</p> <p>A3 Although Alternative 3 would construct a building with a smaller profile than the Proposed Project, but removal of the orange trees and loss of open space around the Mansion would result in a significant impact on the historic setting, even though it would not remove the Mansion from the National Register.</p> <p>A4 Alternative 4 would have effects similar to Alternative 3 with the additional loss of the Tank House, and would result in a significant impact on the historic setting.</p> <p>A5 Alternative 5 would be barely visible through the street trees and orange trees from Second Street, and mostly maintain a setback from Second Street similar to the Mansion. The impact to the historic residential setting would be less than significant.</p> <p>A6 Alternative 6 would disassemble/reassemble and rehabilitate the Tank House in situ and preserve the orange trees on site. This would be a less-than-significant impact on the historic setting.</p>	<p>None available</p> <p>None available</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None required</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Less than significant</p> <p>Less than significant</p>
<p>Cultural and Historic Resources</p>	<p>Impact 5.2-4 Cumulative loss of cultural resources</p> <p>PP The Proposed Project would demolish the Tank House and 10 historic orange trees, contributing resources to the Mansion, and would potentially disturb archaeological resources when trenching for the foundation and utilities for a new three-story building. This would be a significant cumulative impact.</p> <p>A1 The No Project Alternative could require a new foundation to stabilize the Tank House to keep it from falling into the Mansion, and trenching for the foundation would potentially disturb archaeological resources. This could result in a significant cumulative impact.</p> <p>A2 Alternative 2 would remove the contributing 10 historic</p>	<p>For the PP and all alternatives, implement Mitigation Measures 5.2-1a through 5.2-1d, and 5.2-2a and 5.2-2b.</p> <p>For PP, A2, A3, A4, and A5, these mitigation measures would reduce the magnitude of potential cumulative impacts to cultural and historic resources, but not to a less-than-significant level.</p>	<p>Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Less than significant</p> <p>Significant and</p>

Impact Category	Potential Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	<p>orange trees, and would potentially disturb archaeological resources when trenching for the foundation and utilities for a new three-story building. This would be a significant cumulative impact.</p> <p>A3 Alternative 3 would remove the contributing 10 historic orange trees, and would potentially disturb archaeological resources when trenching for the foundation and utilities for a new two-story building and adaptive reuse of the Tank House. This would be a significant cumulative impact.</p> <p>A4 Alternative 4 would demolish the Tank House and 10 historic orange trees, contributing resources to the Mansion, and would potentially disturb archaeological resources when trenching for the foundation and utilities for a new two-story building. This would be a significant cumulative impact.</p> <p>A5 Alternative 5 would remove five Landmark orange trees, and would potentially disturb archaeological resources when trenching for the foundation and utilities for a relocated and rehabilitated Tank House and greenhouse-type addition, causing a significant cumulative impact.</p> <p>A6 Alternative 6 would potentially disturb archaeological resources when trenching for the foundation and utilities for a rehabilitated Tank House. This would be a significant cumulative impact.</p>		<p>unavoidable</p> <p>Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Less than significant</p>
Cultural and Historic Resources	<p>Impact 5.2-5 Cumulative impact on preliminary identified historic district</p> <p>The Multiple Project Cumulative Impact Analysis (CIA) determined that the Proposed Project, in conjunction with the Anderson Bank Building Project, would not cumulatively</p>	None required	Less than significant

Impact Category	Potential Environmental Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance
	<p>result in a significant loss of integrity on the potentially identified Downtown Davis Historic District. The potential loss of integrity to individually significant buildings that serve as the contributing anchors to the preliminarily identified historic district would not remove the potential district's eligibility for a local or state-level historic sites register. Therefore, the Proposed Project and all alternatives would result in a less-than-significant cumulative impact on the potential Downtown Historic District.</p>		