# 2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## INTRODUCTION

The Executive Summary chapter of the EIR provides an overview of the Wildhorse Ranch project (described in detail in Chapter 3 – Project Description), and summarizes the conclusions of the environmental analysis (provided in detail in Chapter 4 – Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation). This chapter also summarizes the alternatives to the proposed project that are described in Chapter 5, Alternatives Analysis, and identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Table 2-1, at the end of this chapter, provides a summary of the environmental effects of the proposed project identified in each technical chapter. The table contains the environmental impacts, the significance of the impacts for the proposed project, the proposed mitigation measures, and the significance of the impacts after the mitigation measures are implemented.

## PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The project site consists of approximately 25.79 acres of land within the City of Davis, Yolo County, California. The project site is located at 3003, 3027, and 3075 East Covell Boulevard, at the intersection of East Covell Boulevard and Monarch Lane. The site is identified by Yolo County Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 071-140-11. The current City of Davis General Plan (adopted May 2001) designation for the site is Agriculture.

The proposed site is located in the southeast corner of the Wildhorse subdivision. To the east of the site is the Davis greenbelt and agricultural buffer, to the south is Davis Manor and portions of Mace Ranch neighborhoods, and to the west and north are established residential portions of the Wildhorse subdivision.

The project involves the development of up to 191 residential units. The Site Plan for the project indicates that the 25.79-acre project site would include the following mix of residential uses and densities: 73 detached single-family residences, and 78 two to three story attached single-family townhome units (including 36 middle-income units) on 11.95-acres and 1.92-acres of attached affordable housing for a maximum of 40 units at 21 du/ac. The project would require the approval of a General Plan Amendment to redesignate the site's land use from Agriculture to five uses; Residential High Density, Residential Medium Density, Neighborhood Greenbelt, Natural Habitat Area, and Urban Agricultural Transition Area. In addition, the project would require rezone of the site from Planned Development #3-89, which allows for horse boarding and breeding and farming, to a new Planned Development designation. In addition, redesignation of the project site from Agriculture to residential uses would be subject to Measure J, requiring voter approval.

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION

Under CEQA, a significant effect on the environment is defined 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, mineral, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. Implementation of the proposed project could result in significant impacts on the resource areas listed below.

This Draft EIR discusses mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce potential adverse impacts to a level that is considered less-than-significant. Such mitigation measures are noted in this Draft EIR and are found in the following technical sections: Land Use and Agricultural Resources; Transportation and Circulation; Air Quality; Noise; Biological Resources; Aesthetics; Hydrology, Water Quality, and Drainage; Public Services and Facilities, and Climate Change. If an impact is determined to be significant, applicable mitigation measures are identified, as appropriate. These mitigation measures are also summarized in Table 2-1 at the end of this chapter. The mitigation measures presented in the Draft EIR will form the basis of the Mitigation Monitoring Plan. An impact that remains significant after including all feasible mitigation measures is considered a significant and unavoidable impact.

### Land Use and Agricultural Resources

The Land Use and Agricultural Resources section evaluates the consistency of the proposed project with City of Davis adopted plans and policies. The evaluation is based on a thorough review of the City of Davis General Plan and the Davis Zoning Ordinance, as well as any other appropriate documents, to address consistency issues. The Land Use and Agricultural Resources section further assesses the compatibility of the proposed project with surrounding land uses, both existing and proposed. In addition, the Land Use and Agricultural Resources section summarizes the status of the existing agricultural resources on the project site and areas surrounding the City of Davis, using the current State model and data, including identification of any State-designated Important Farmlands on the project site. Any conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use, existing Williamson Act contracts, or right-to-farm ordinances applicable to the project site are also identified. This section further includes a discussion regarding conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

The Land Use analysis notes that significant incompatibilities would arise from the proximity of the proposed residences to nearby agricultural operations with implementation of the proposed project. However, the impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the section. Impacts related to consistency with City of Davis plans, policies, or ordinances and the Davis Planned Development district process were determined to be less-than-significant.

The Agricultural Resources analysis indicates that the majority of the 25.79-acre project site contains soils that are highly suitable for agricultural production and are considered Prime Farmland soils (if irrigated). The General Plan Update EIR states that any conversion of prime agricultural land to urban uses would result in a significant and unavoidable impact. The impact to prime agricultural lands would be reduced by implementing the mitigation measures identified

in the section; however, the loss of Prime Farmland associated with implementation of the proposed project would remain a significant and unavoidable impact in both the short-term and cumulative scenarios.

**Population, Housing, and Employment**

The Population, Housing, and Employment section of the Draft EIR summarizes regional and local demographic information, and identifies projected population changes resulting from the proposed project.

The Draft EIR determined that development of the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts regarding consistency with Growth Management Action "e" in the General Plan's goals and policies related to population growth. The Draft EIR found that long-term impacts to population, housing, and employment from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Davis area would be less-than-significant. In addition, the following impacts associated with population, housing, and employment were identified as less-than-significant: a) impacts related to inconsistency with City of Davis affordable housing policies and Affordable Housing Ordinance; and b) impacts to employment and housing.

**Transportation and Circulation**

The Transportation and Circulation section of the Draft EIR is based on a traffic study prepared for the Wildhorse Ranch project site. The Transportation and Circulation section describes existing traffic conditions, summarizes the existing and planned regional and local transportation network, and describes the traffic load and capacity of street systems, including level of service standards for critical street segments and intersections. In addition, the section includes an analysis of the Existing Plus Project scenario and cumulative traffic scenarios (Cumulative No Project and Cumulative Plus Project). Other issues addressed in the section include traffic hazards due to design features, emergency access, and bicycle, pedestrian and transit facilities.

The Transportation and Circulation analysis determined that project-level impacts to study intersections and roadways and impacts to transit facilities would be less-than-significant. However, under the cumulative scenario a significant impact would occur to the Mace Boulevard/Second Street intersection. In addition, several traffic-related impacts are identified as significant in the analysis, including impacts related to the provision of efficient site access and circulation, impacts related to pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation, and impacts to traffic flow from construction traffic associated with grading and development of the project site. However, implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the section would reduce the identified significant impacts to less-than-significant levels.

**Air Quality**

The Air Quality section summarizes the regional air quality setting, including climate and topography, ambient air quality, and regulatory setting, and is based on an air quality assessment prepared for the Wildhorse Ranch project. The Air Quality section describes the impacts of the proposed project on local and regional air quality. The section includes a discussion of the

existing air quality and associated impacts, construction-related air quality impacts resulting from grading and equipment emissions, direct and indirect emissions associated with the project, the impacts of these emissions on both the local and regional scale, and mitigation measures warranted to reduce or eliminate any identified significant impacts. In addition, this section addresses carbon monoxide impacts, impacts associated with project construction activities, and cumulative air quality impacts.

The Air Quality analysis determined that impacts pertaining to increased carbon monoxide concentrations at project-area intersections, new air pollutant emissions within the air basin resulting from operation, and cumulative air quality impacts of the proposed project would be less-than-significant. Impacts found to be significant were those related to exhaust emissions and fugitive dust emissions from project-associated construction activities. The impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the section.

**Noise**

The Noise section of the Draft EIR is based on an environmental noise assessment prepared for the Wildhorse Ranch project site. The noise assessment includes an analysis of the existing noise setting, including measurements of existing traffic and general ambient noise levels in and near the project area. The Noise section identifies all significant noise impacts on, and generated by, the proposed project. In addition, the Noise section evaluates noise levels associated with the construction and operation of the Wildhorse Ranch project and the resulting impacts to sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the project site. Determination of significance is based on the criteria set forth in the City of Davis General Plan Noise Element and City of Davis Zoning Code, as well as applicable State guidelines.

The Noise analysis concludes that impacts associated with an increase of existing traffic noise levels on surrounding roadways, including cumulative impacts of traffic noise levels at outdoor activity areas proposed within the 60 dB Ldn contours, first-floor and upper-floor residential uses proposed within the 60 dB Ldn contours, cumulative impacts of traffic noise levels at interior residential areas proposed within the 60 dB Ldn contours, and noise impacts related to agricultural activities would be less-than-significant. A few significant noise-related impacts would occur with implementation of the proposed project, including short-term noise impacts from construction activities and noise impacts associated with greenbelt maintenance activities. All impacts identified as significant in the noise analysis would be reduced to less-than-significant levels through the implementation of the mitigation measures found in the section.

**Biological Resources**

The Biological Resources section of the Draft EIR summarizes the existing biological resources setting for the project area. Data from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are analyzed and reviewed. The section presents the results of a records search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), which was conducted to determine the potential of the project area to support rare, threatened, endangered, or otherwise sensitive species. In addition, the section provides the results of on-site

field studies pertaining to the identification of potential habitats for special-status species and wetlands. Finally, the section identifies the biological resources-related permits required as part of the development process.

The Draft EIR determined that development of the proposed project would have significant impacts to special-status animal species including, but not limited to, the American badger, the western burrowing owl, Swainson's hawk, other nesting birds, and certain bat species. However, mitigation measures recommended in the Draft EIR would reduce impacts to these species and the species' habitats to a less-than-significant level. The removal of trees was also found to be significant; however, implementation of appropriate mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level. In addition, impacts related to the cumulative loss of biological resources in the City of Davis were found to be less-than-significant.

**Aesthetics**

The Aesthetics section of the Draft EIR summarizes existing regional and project area aesthetics, including a description of the existing visual character or quality of the site. In addition, the section includes an analysis of whether any scenic vistas, scenic highways, or scenic resources (e.g., trees and/or historic resources) exist within the project area. Creation of new sources of light and glare by the project and the effects of the light and glare upon the project's vicinity are also evaluated in the Aesthetics section.

The Aesthetics analysis concludes that impacts to scenic resources would be less-than-significant. Impacts related to light and glare were determined to be significant because the development of residential units would generate new sources of light and glare such as residential lighting, streetlights, and lighting associated with the greenbelt amenity. In order to reduce impacts from light and glare, the applicant has proposed the dedication of an additional 20 feet to each property owner adjacent to the north and west boundary of the project. In addition, the proposed project includes development of an orchard area beyond the 20-foot dedication. This would help reduce light and glare impacts resulting from the project and, along with implementation of the mitigation measure found in the section, would reduce light and glare impacts to a less-than-significant level. However, as stated in the Davis General Plan Update EIR, overall visual impacts pertaining to the conversion of open space or agricultural land to urban uses would result in visual impacts that cannot be mitigated under either near-term or cumulative conditions. Therefore, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

**Hydrology, Water Quality, and Drainage**

The Hydrology, Water Quality, and Drainage section summarizes existing setting information and identifies potential project-associated impacts pertaining to irrigation drainage, stormwater drainage, flooding, seepage, and water quality. The analysis includes on-site and off-site infrastructure facilities.

The Draft EIR determined that the proposed project site is not located within the 100-year floodplain as shown on the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map 0604240029C (FIRM). Other impacts found to be significant include construction-related impacts to surface water quality and

cumulative impacts related to the degradation of water quality. Mitigation measures recommended in the Draft EIR would reduce impacts related to flood hazards and water quality to a less-than-significant level. Impacts associated with increased stormwater runoff from the project site contributing to downstream flooding were found to be less-than-significant with implementation of required mitigation.

**Public Services and Facilities**

The Public Services and Facilities section of the Draft EIR summarizes existing setting information and identifies potential new demand for services on the domestic water supply, wastewater treatment systems, fire protection, law enforcement, solid waste disposal, gas and electric service, schools, and parks and recreation. This section is based in part on technical memoranda provided by the City and Project Engineer in regard to water, sanitary sewer, and storm drain facilities.

The Draft EIR found that implementation of the proposed project would result in increased demands for public services and facilities. These increased demands would result in significant impacts to water supply, wastewater treatment, law enforcement, schools, and park and recreation facilities. However, the Draft EIR includes mitigation measures that would reduce the above impacts to public services and facilities to a less-than-significant level. In addition, the Public Services and Facilities section concluded that impacts related to the following project impacts would be less-than-significant: a) increased demand for solid waste disposal/recycling services; b) impacts to gas and electric facilities; and c) a cumulative increase in demand for additional public services and utilities. The Draft EIR determined that the project site is located outside of the City of Davis Fire Department five minute response area and even with implementation of mitigation, a significant and unavoidable impact would remain.

As stated in chapter 1, Introduction, the Initial Study prepared for the proposed project concluded that the environmental issues addressed in the Draft EIR would be those that would result in potentially significant impacts. The remaining environmental issues were addressed and dismissed in the Initial Study, which is included as an attachment to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) in Appendix A.

**Climate Change**

The Climate Change section of the EIR describes the potential impacts of the Wildhorse Ranch project related to greenhouse gas emissions and climate change. The chapter includes a discussion of the potential impacts of these emissions on both local and regional scales, and mitigation measures warranted to reduce any identified significant impacts to the extent feasible. The Climate Change analysis indicates that even with implementation of the mitigation measures a significant and unavoidable impact would result.

## SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The following summary provides brief descriptions of the five alternatives to the proposed project that are evaluated in this Draft EIR. For a more thorough discussion of project alternatives, please refer to Chapter 5, Alternatives Analysis.

### No Project/No Build Alternative

Under the No Project/No Build Alternative, the project site would remain a horse ranch with associated pastures. However, in the future the owners could convert the project site to other agricultural uses under the existing designation.

### Reduced Intensity Alternatives

Viewshed Preservation Alternative

The intent of the Viewshed Preservation Alternative is to maintain the partial views of agricultural land and the Sierras east of the project, which are currently afforded to existing residents immediately west of the project site. In order to still achieve the basic objectives of the project, the project site would still be developed with residential uses, albeit, at a lower density than the Proposed Project. Similar to the Proposed Project, this Alternative would involve a General Plan Amendment. For this Alternative, the project site would be re-designated from Agriculture to Low Density Residential. Using the minimum density of the Low Density Residential designation of three units per acre, the Viewshed Preservation Alternative would include 75 units (3 du/acre * 25 acres = 75 dwelling units). Similar single-family product types would be included in this Alternative as are included in the Proposed Project; however, the Alternative would comply with the affordable housing requirement through the creative placement of attached residences, such as duplexes on corner lots. Average lot size would be approximately 0.25 acres in area. The large lot sizes would allow for the development of single-level ranch style units, which would reduce the impact of the development associated with the change in the current character of the site. Furthermore, single-level houses would obstruct fewer views of the Sierra foothills given a maximum building height of 20 feet. In comparison, the Proposed Project includes structures of up to three stories in height. Land dedications for roadways, agricultural buffers, and greenbelt/open space would remain the same as for the Proposed Project.

Agricultural Character Alternative

Similar to the Viewshed Preservation Alternative, the Agricultural Character Alternative would include the construction of 75 residential dwelling units. The units would be predominantly detached single-family residences; however, duplexes would be included to provide the affordable housing component. The Agricultural Character Alternative would differ from the Viewshed Preservation Alternative in that housing would be clustered on smaller lots. A preliminary concept for this Alternative includes lots of approximately 1/6$^{th}$ of an acre, resulting in 12.5 acres being devoted to residential use (See Table 6-2 for land use acreages). The remaining lands would likely be utilized for small-scale agricultural production of grapes,

fruiting trees, or row crops. Trees provided for the residential lots would be agricultural in nature, and could include: olives, walnuts, almonds, or other fruiting trees that would provide both shade and a potential crop. Agricultural lands would likely be owned by the Homeowners Association and leased to an individual or group that would conduct the agricultural operations. An access easement could be included to provide harvesting access to trees in the front yard of residences for tree crops such as olives. The agricultural concept would be woven throughout the development; however, dedicated lands would likely be concentrated along the central greenbelt, adjacent to the agricultural buffer area, and/or in the central portion of the project site. The intended product would be determined at a later date. Similar to the Viewshed Preservation Alternative, low height, low profile street lights would be utilized to reduce the visual presence of the project.

**Off-Site Alternatives**

Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR.

Infill Site Alternative

The Infill Site Alternative would combine geographically separated sites to develop the same project components on a land area of approximately the same size as the Proposed Project. Many potential sites exist within the existing City Limits; however, for the purposes of this analysis three sites have been identified for discussion:

- Simmons Properties (12 acres)
- Grande School Site (8.83 acres)
- Nugget Fields (9.01)

None of the above listed properties are currently owned by the project applicant. Grande School site recently received entitlement approvals from the City Council for the development of 41 single-family units. The property is owned by the school district who intends to sell the entitled property to prospective developers. Project applications have been submitted for the Simmons property for the development of 108 single-family units. The Simmons applications are under review and have not been approved by the City Council. No formal applications have been submitted to the City for the development of the Nugget Fields at this time. Simmons and Nugget Fields sites would require General Plan Amendments and changes of zoning; however, the sites are located within the City Limits and are not designated for agricultural use. Therefore, regardless of which sites are combined for this Alternative, unlike the Proposed Project, approval of this Alternative would not be subject to Measure J voter approval. A combination of any two of the three sites would make up a total of 17.4 to 21 acres. The total land area would be smaller under these potential combinations as compared to the Proposed Project; however, the Proposed Project could still be accommodated as the agricultural buffers would not be required. Therefore, a similar number of residences could be constructed.

Measure J Alternative

The Measure J Alternative project site is located in Yolo County, north and east of the City of Davis City limits, southwest of the curve where East Covell Boulevard becomes Mace Boulevard. The Alternative site is comprised of approximately 47 acres. Similar to the Proposed Project, the Measure J site would need to be annexed to the City of Davis and would require public approval pursuant to Measure J. The site is not currently owned by the current project applicant. The Measure J Alternative would result in the construction of the same number and type of residential units. However, both the dedicated greenbelt/open space and single-family detached lots sizes would be increased to fill the approximately 21 additional acres.

**Environmentally Superior Alternative**

For the Wildhorse Ranch Project, aside from the No Project Alternative, the Infill Site Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative. The Infill Site Alternative, Viewshed Preservation Alternative, and Agricultural Preservation Alternative would all reduce several of the impact areas discussed for the Proposed Project such as aesthetics, air quality, and noise. However, only the Infill Site Alternative would eliminate the significant and unavoidable impacts to aesthetics by placing the project on lands already designated for urban uses. Therefore, the Infill Site Alternative would result in fewer environmental impacts than the Proposed Project while still providing opportunities to achieve most of the City's and the Applicant's project objectives.

## SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The following Table (Table 2-1) summarizes the impacts identified in Chapter 4 of this Draft EIR. In Table 2-1, the proposed project impacts are identified for each technical chapter (Chapters 4.1 – 4.10) in the Draft EIR. In addition, Table 2-1 includes the level of significance of each impact, any mitigation measures required for each impact, and the resulting level of significance after implementation of mitigation measures for each impact.

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4.1 Land Use and Agricultural Resources** | | | | | |
| 4.1-1 | Consistency with the City of Davis General Plan. | LS | *4.1-1* | *None required.* | N/A |
| 4.1-2 | Consistency with the Davis Planned Development district process. | LS | *4.1-2* | *None required.* | N/A |
| 4.1-3 | Loss of prime agricultural land. | S | *4.1-3* | *The project applicant shall set aside in perpetuity active agricultural acreage at a minimum ratio of 2:1 based on the total project footprint of 25.79 acres, through granting a farmland conservation easement, a farmland deed restriction, or other farmland conservation mechanism to or for the benefit of the City and/or a qualifying entity approved by the City. The mitigation acreage shall be set aside prior to recordation of the final map(s). The location and amount of active agricultural acreage for the proposed project would be subject to the review and approval of the City Council.* | SU |
| 4.1-4 | Incompatibilities between future residential uses on the project site and surrounding uses. | S | *4.1-4(a)* | *Consistent with Action AG 1.1(g) of the General Plan and the Davis Right-to-Farm Ordinance, the applicant/developer shall inform and provide recorded notice to prospective buyers within 1,000 feet of agricultural land in writing and prior to purchase, as prescribed by the City's Right to Farm Ordinance, about existing and on-going agricultural activities in the immediate area in the form of a disclosure statement. The notifications shall disclose that Davis and Yolo County are agricultural areas and residents of the property may be subject to inconvenience or discomfort* | LS |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | *arising from the use of agricultural chemicals, and from pursuit of agricultural operations, including, but not limited to cultivation, irrigation, plowing, spraying, aerial application, pruning, harvesting, crop protection, and agricultural burning which occasionally generate dust, smoke, noise, and odor. The language and format of such notification shall be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Director prior to recording final maps. Each disclosure statement shall be acknowledged with the signature of each prospective property owner.* | |
| | | *4.1-4(b) Prior to the use of pesticides on the orchard, the Home Owner's Association and contractor(s) shall obtain a permit and comply with all regulations from the Yolo County Agricultural Commissioner. In addition, signage shall be posted at the perimeter of the orchard notifying the public that pesticides have been recently applied. The signage shall remain posted for the appropriate length, as determined during the permit process.* | |
| | | *4.1-4(c) Prior to recordation of final map(s), in the event the Davis Sports Park is constructed adjacent and east of the proposed project, the applicant shall prepare and submit a disclosure statement for the review and approval of the Community Development Director which shall disclose the operations associated with the Davis Sports Park Project which will include ballfield lights, weekly games, tournaments etc. Language shall* | |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | *be included on the final map(s) to ensure that the disclosure of the Sports Park runs with the land, and is therefore provided to all prospective buyers of property.* | |
| 4.1-5 Long-term impacts to Prime Farmland from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Davis area. | S | *4.1-5* *Implement Mitigation Measure 4.1-3.* | SU |
| 4.1-6 Consistency with the City of Davis' plans, policies, or ordinances. | LS | *4.1-6* *None required.* | N/A |
| **4.2 Population, Housing, and Employment** | | | |
| 4.2-1 Inconsistency with City of Davis affordable housing policies and Affordable Housing Ordinance. | LS | *4.2-1* *None required.* | N/A |
| 4.2-2 Inconsistency with Growth Management Action "e" of the Davis General Plan. | LS | *4.2-2* *None required.* | N/A |
| 4.2-3 Impacts to employment and housing. | LS | *4.2-3* *None required.* | N/A |
| 4.2-4 Long-term impacts to population, housing, and employment from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Davis area. | LS | *4.2-4* *None required.* | N/A |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **4.3 Transportation and Circulation** | | | | | |
| 4.3-1 | Impacts to study intersections and roadways. | LS | *4.3-1* | *None required.* | N/A |
| 4.3-2 | Impacts related to the provision of efficient site access and circulation. | S | *4.3-2* | *Prior to approval of the Tentative Map, the project applicant shall ensure that the following items are incorporated into the project design, for the review and approval by the City Engineer:*<br>• *Provision of adequate sight distance at both project access intersections, by setting back any barrier walls far enough from the curb, and by ensuring that existing and new plantings do not obstruct drivers' views;*<br>• *Design of the internal roadways to meet City standards, and inclusion of internal traffic calming elements as may be determined to be necessary, subject to the review and approval of the City Engineer; and*<br>• *Provision of traffic control devices, if and where needed in the internal roadway system, based on an analysis of the internal traffic turning movements to be prepared when the project design is more detailed.* | LS |
| 4.3-3 | Impacts related to pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation. | S | *4.3-3* | *Prior to approval of the Tentative Map, the project applicant shall ensure that the pathway and sidewalk network meets ADA accessibility requirements, subject to the review and approval by the City Engineer.* | LS |
| 4.3-4 | Impacts related to transit access. | LS | *4.3-4* | *None required.* | N/A |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| 4.3-5 Impacts to traffic flow from construction traffic associated with grading and development of the project site. | S | *4.3-5* *Prior to any on-site construction activities, the project applicant shall prepare a Construction Traffic Management Plan subject to the review and approval by the City Engineer. The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall include all measures for temporary traffic control, temporary signage and striping, location points for ingress and egress of construction vehicles, haul routes, staging areas, and shall provide for the timing of construction activity that appropriately limits hours during which large construction equipment may be brought onto or taken off of the site.* | LS |
| 4.3-6 Cumulative impacts regarding the deterioration of the Second Street / Mace Boulevard intersection LOS. | S | *4.3-6* *Prior to the issuance of building permits, or such other time as may be approved at the time of Tentative Map, the project applicant shall pay a fair share fee, as determined by the City Public Works Department, for improvements to the intersection of Second Street and Mace Boulevard; these improvements may include, but are not necessarily limited to: construction of a second left-turn lane on the northbound approach to the intersection of Second Street and Mace Boulevard, re-striping of the eastbound through lane to a shared through-left turn lane, and modification of the signal phasing to allow eastbound and westbound split phasing.* | LS |
| **4.4 Air Quality** | | | |
| 4.4-1 Exhaust emissions and fugitive dust emissions from project- | S | *4.4-1* *Prior to commencement of any ground disturbing activities, the applicant shall submit a dust control plan* | LS |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| associated construction activities. | | *to the City Engineer and the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District. This plan shall ensure that adequate dust controls are implemented during all phases of project construction. The dust control best management practices (BMPs) may include but are not necessarily limited to the following:*<br>• *Apply nontoxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturer's specifications to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more);*<br>• *Reestablish ground cover in disturbed areas quickly;*<br>• *Water recently disturbed construction areas (ground disturbed within 10 days) at least twice daily to avoid visible dust plumes;*<br>• *Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites;*<br>• *Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.);*<br>• *Enforce a speed limit of 15 MPH for equipment and vehicles operated in unpaved areas;*<br>• *All vehicles hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials shall be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard; and*<br>• *Sweep streets at the end of the day if visible soil* | |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | *material is carried onto adjacent public paved roads.* | |
| 4.4-2 New air pollutant emissions within the air basin resulting from operation of the proposed project. | LS | *4.4-2* *None required.* | N/A |
| 4.4-3 Increased carbon monoxide concentrations at project-area intersections. | LS | *4.4-3* *None required.* | N/A |
| 4.4-4 Long-term air quality impacts from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Davis area. | LS | *4.4-4* *None required.* | N/A |
| **4.5 Noise** | | | |
| 4.5-1 Impacts associated with an increase of existing traffic noise levels on surrounding roadways. | LS | *4.5-1* *None required.* | N/A |
| 4.5-2 Noise impacts associated with existing agricultural activities. | LS | *4.5-2* *None required.* | N/A |
| 4.5-3 Short-term noise impacts from construction activities. | S | *4.5-3* *Compliance with the following measures shall be incorporated within the Final Planned Development with specific criteria and standards to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission:*<br>• *Construction activities shall be scheduled to occur during normal daytime working hours (i.e., 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM Monday through* | LS |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | *Friday and 8:00 AM to 8:00 PM Saturday and Sunday). These criteria shall be included in the Improvement Plans prior to initiation of construction. Exceptions to allow expanded construction activity hours shall be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as determined by the Community Development Director;*<br>• *All heavy construction equipment and all stationary noise sources (such as diesel generators) shall be fitted with factory-specified mufflers; and*<br>• *Equipment warm up areas, water tanks, and equipment storage areas shall be located in an area as far away from existing residences as feasible.* | |
| 4.5-4 | Noise impacts associated with greenbelt and orchard maintenance activities. | S | *4.5-4* | *Prior to recordation of final map, disclosure statements advising that periods of orchard and greenbelt maintenance could result in elevated noise levels, shall be prepared and submitted for the review and approval of the Community Development Director. A copy of the approved disclosure statements shall be provided to all prospective buyers of property within the Wildhorse Ranch Subdivision. Language shall be included on the Final Map to ensure that the disclosure of elevated noise levels are provided at the time of all future sales.* | LS |
| 4.5-5 | Cumulative impact of traffic noise levels. | LS | *4.5-5* | *None required.* | N/A |
| 4.5-6 | Cumulative impact of traffic noise levels at outdoor activity | LS | *4.5-6* | *None required.* | N/A |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| | Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | areas proposed within the 60 dB Ldn contours. | | | | |
| 4.5-7 | Cumulative impact of traffic noise levels at interior residential uses proposed within the 60 dB Ldn contours. | LS | *4.5-7* | *None required.* | N/A |
| | **4.6 Biological Resources** | | | | |
| 4.6-1 | Potential Impacts to the American Badger. | S | *4.6-1(a)* | *A qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for American badger in all construction areas identified as potential habitat located within the project area two weeks prior to initiation of construction activities. If an American badger or active burrow, indicated by the presence of badger sign (i.e. suitable shape and burrow-size, scat) is found within the construction area during pre-construction surveys, the CDFG shall be consulted to obtain permission for animal relocation.* | LS |
| | | | *4.6-1(b)* | *If the qualified biologist determines that potential dens are inactive, the biologist shall excavate these dens by hand with a shovel to prevent badgers from re-using them during construction.* | |
| | | | *4.6-1(c)* | *If the qualified biologist determines that potential dens may be active, the entrances of the dens shall be blocked with soil, sticks, and debris for three to five days to discourage use of these dens prior to project disturbance. The den entrances shall be blocked to an* | |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *incrementally greater degree over the three to five day period. After the qualified biologist determines that badgers have stopped using active dens within the project boundary, the dens shall be hand-excavated with a shovel to prevent re-use during construction.* | |
| | | *4.6-1(d)* | *If badger are determined to be actively using the site, a qualified biologist shall provide project contractors and construction crews responsible for site demolition and/or grading operations with a worker-awareness program before any ground disturbance work within the project area. This program shall be used to describe the species, its habits and habitats, its legal status and required protection, and all applicable mitigation measures.* | |
| 4.6-2 Potential Impacts to Western Burrowing Owl. | S | *4.6-2(a)* | *Prior to commencement of construction-related activities for the project including, but not limited to, grading, staging of materials, or earthmoving activities and within 15 days of initiation of any grading or other construction activities, pre-construction surveys of all potential burrowing owl habitat shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within the project area and within 250 feet of the project boundary. Presence or sign of burrowing owl and all potentially occupied burrows shall be recorded and monitored according to the CDFG and California Burrowing Owl Consortium guidelines. If burrowing owls are not detected by sign or direct observation, construction may proceed.* | LS |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | *4.6-2(b)* *If potentially nesting burrowing owl are present during pre-construction surveys conducted between February 1 and August 31, grading or other construction related disturbance shall not be allowed within 250 feet of any active nest burrows during the nesting season (February 1 – August 31) unless approved by CDFG.*<br><br>*4.6-2(c)* *If burrowing owl are detected during pre-construction surveys outside the nesting season (September 1 – January 31), passive relocation and monitoring may be undertaken by a qualified biologist following the CDFG and California Burrowing Owl Consortium guidelines, which involve the placement of one-way exclusion doors on occupied and potentially occupied burrowing owl burrows. Owls shall be excluded from all suitable burrows within the project area and within a 250-foot buffer zone of the impact area. A minimum of one week shall be allowed to accomplish this task and allow for owls to acclimate to alternate burrows. These mitigation actions shall be carried out prior to the burrowing owl breeding season (February 1 - August 31) and the site shall be monitored weekly by a qualified biologist until construction begins to ensure that burrowing owls do not re-inhabit the site.*<br><br>*4.6-2(d)* *If burrowing owl or sign of burrowing owl are detected at any time on the project site, a minimum of 6.5 acres of foraging habitat per pair or individual resident bird, shall be acquired and permanently protected to* | |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | *compensate for the loss of burrowing owl habitat. The acreage shall be based on the maximum number of owls observed inhabiting the property for any given observation period, pre-construction survey, or other field visit. The protected lands shall be occupied burrowing owl habitat and at a location acceptable to CDFG. A report shall be submitted to the City describing the agreed upon location. First priority for habitat preservation shall be accomplished on-site. If the required acreage cannot be preserved on-site, second priority shall be given to habitat preservation at an off-site location within the Davis city limits that shall be acquired and preserved in perpetuity. Third priority shall be given to another off-site location outside of the Davis city limits. Habitat in the amount specified above shall be acquired, permanently protected, and enhanced through management for the benefit of the species, to compensate for the loss of burrowing owl habitat on the project site. Alternatively, the applicant can provide the required mitigation either through an in-lieu fee program, purchase of the required acreage in an approved mitigation bank, or an approved Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP).*<br><br>*4.6-2(e)* *If burrowing owl are determined to be actively using the site, a qualified biologist shall conduct an education session for project contractors and construction crews responsible for site demolition and/or grading operations before any ground disturbance work within* | |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | *the project area. The education session, shall include includes photos of burrowing owl for identification purposes, habitat description, limits of construction activities in the project area, and guidance regarding general measures being implemented to conserve burrowing owl as they relate to the project. A qualified biologist shall provide materials and instructions to train new workers whose jobs involve initial ground disturbance, grading, or paving. Training for personnel finalizing exteriors and interiors would not be required.*<br><br>*4.6-2(f)* *A monitoring report of all activities associated with pre-construction surveys, avoidance measures, and passive relocation of burrowing owls shall be submitted to the City and CDFG no later than three days before initiation of grading.* | |
| 4.6-3 Potential Impacts to Nesting Birds. | S | *4.6-3(a)* *The removal of any buildings, trees, or shrubs shall occur from September 1 through December 15, outside of the avian nesting season. If removal of buildings, trees, or shrubs occurs, or construction begins between February 1 and August 31 (nesting season for passerine or non-passerine land birds) or between December 15 and August 31 (nesting season for raptors), a nesting bird survey shall be performed by a qualified ornithologist within 15 days prior to the removal or disturbance of a potential nesting structure, tree, or shrub, or the initiation of other construction activities. During this survey, a qualified biologist shall inspect all potential nesting habitat (trees, shrubs, structures,* | LS |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *grasslands, etc.) for nests in and immediately adjacent to the impact areas. A report of the survey findings shall be provided to the City and CDFG.* | |
| | | *4.6-3(b)* | *All vegetation and structures with active nests shall be flagged and an appropriate non-disturbance buffer zone shall be established around the nest site. The size of the buffer zone shall be determined by the project biologist in consultation with CDFG and shall depend on the species involved, site conditions, and type of work to be conducted in the area.* | |
| | | *4.6-3(c)* | *A qualified biologist shall monitor active nests to determine when the young have fledged and are feeding on their own. The project biologist and CDFG shall be consulted for clearance before construction activities resume in the vicinity.* | |
| 4.6-4 Potential Impacts to Special-Status Bat Species. | S | *4.6-4(a)* | *A pre-construction survey for roosting bats shall be performed by a qualified biologist within 30 days prior to any removal of trees or structures on the site. If no active roosts are found, then no further action would be warranted. If either a maternity roost or hibernacula (structures used by bats for hibernation) is present, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented.* | LS |
| | | *4.6-4(b)* | *If active maternity roosts or hibernacula are found in trees or structures which will be removed as part of project construction, the project shall be redesigned to avoid the loss of the tree or structure occupied by the* | |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | *roost to the extent feasible as determined by the City. If an active maternity roost is located and the project cannot be redesigned to avoid removal of the occupied tree or structure, demolition shall commence before maternity colonies form (i.e., prior to March 1) or after young are volant (flying) (i.e., after July 31). Disturbance-free buffer zones, as determined by a qualified biologist in coordination with CDFG, shall be observed during the maternity roost season (March 1 - July 31).* | |
| | | *4.6-4(c)* *If a non-breeding bat hibernacula is found in a tree or structure scheduled for removal, the individuals shall be safely evicted, under the direction of a qualified biologist (as determined by a Memorandum of Understanding with CDFG), by opening the roosting area to allow airflow through the cavity. Demolition shall then follow at least one night after initial disturbance for airflow. This action should allow bats to leave during darkness, thus increasing their chance of finding new roosts with a minimum of potential predation during daylight. Trees or structures with roosts that need to be removed shall first be disturbed at dusk, just prior to removal that same evening, to allow bats to escape during the darker hours.* | |
| | | *4.6-4(d)* *If special-status bats are found roosting within trees or structures on-site that require removal, appropriate replacement roosts shall be created at a suitable* | |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *location on site or off site in coordination with a qualified biologist, CDFG, and the City.* | |
| 4.6-5 Potential Impacts to Nesting Swainson's Hawk. | S | *4.6-5(a)* | *In order to ensure that nesting Swainson's hawks will not be affected by construction on the project site, a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys according to the CDFG and Swainson's hawk Technical Advisory Committee guidelines (2000). Survey Period I occurs from January 1 – March 20, Period II from March 20 – April 5, Period III from April 5 – April 20, Period IV from April 21 – June 10, and Period V from June 10 – July 30. Three surveys shall be completed in at least each of the two survey periods immediately prior to a project's initiation and shall encompass the area within one half mile of the project site.* | LS |
| | | *4.6-5(b)* | *Because of the potential for Swainson's hawk to nest on-site, potential adverse affects to this species shall be avoided by establishment of CDFG approved buffers around any active nests. No construction activities shall take place within 0.25 mile of the nest until the young have fledged, or authorization has been obtained from CDFG. Weekly monitoring reports summarizing nest activities shall be submitted to the City and CDFG until the young have fledged and the nest is determined to be inactive. Trees containing nests that must be removed as a result of project implementation shall be removed during the non-breeding season (late September to March) and in accordance with the CDFG "Staff Report* | |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | *Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson's Hawks in the Central Valley of California," November 8, 1994.* | |
| | | *4.6-5(c)* | *Replacement trees for any potential Swainson's hawk nest trees removed as part of project construction must be planted either on-site or at a nearby site, and/or an in-lieu fee must be paid to the City of Davis Tree Preservation Fund as detailed in Mitigation Measure 4.6-7.* | |
| 4.6-6 Potential Impacts to Swainson's Hawk Foraging Habitat. | S | *4.6-6(a)* | *The applicant shall be responsible for mitigating the loss of any Swainson's hawk foraging habitat. The extent of any necessary mitigation shall be determined by the City in consultation with CDFG; past recommended mitigation for loss of foraging habitat has been at a ratio of one acre of suitable foraging habitat for every one acre utilized by the proposed project. An "Agreement Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to Swainson's Hawk Foraging Habitat in Yolo County" was executed in August, 2002, between the Cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, Woodland, the County of Yolo, and CDFG. The agreement currently requires 1.0 acre of habitat management lands as mitigation for each 1.0 acre of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat lost.* | LS |
| | | *4.6-6(b)* | *The project proponent will compensate for the loss of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat by providing Habitat Management lands (HM lands) to CDFG as defined in the Staff Report Regarding Mitigation for Impacts to* | |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | *Swainson's Hawks in the Central Valley of California (published by California Department of Fish and Game in 1994). If the proposed project is located within 1 mile of an active nest (to be determined with preconstruction surveys) the loss of habitat will be compensated at a ratio of 1:1 (HM lands:urban development). The project proponent will provide HM lands through an in-lieu fee process prior to groundbreaking per the Agreement to Yolo County HCP/NCCP Joint Powers Agency. Credits will be purchased through the in-lieu fee program due to the lack of mitigation credits currently available at a bank. As of January 2007, the cost per acre for the in-lieu fee is $8,660 payable to the Joint Powers Agency. Should the in-lieu fee be increased prior to clearance to grade the project site, the project proponent shall pay the in-lieu fee in effect at that time. The project proponent will issue a check to the Joint Powers Agency if mitigation is required. It is estimated that a total of 15.5 acres of Swainson's hawk foraging habitat would be removed as a result of the project. The applicant shall pay the in-lieu fee for the 15.5 acres based on the removal of this Swainson's hawk foraging habitat.*<br><br>*-Or-*<br><br>*Prior to commencement of construction-related activities for the project including, but not limited to, grading, staging of materials, or earthmoving activities, the project proponent shall place and record one or* | |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | *more Conservation Easements that meet the acreage requirements of CDFG's Swainson's Hawk foraging habitat mitigation guidelines. The conservation easement(s) shall be executed by the project proponent and a Conservation operator. The City may, at its discretion, also be a party to the conservation easement(s). The conservation easement(s) shall be reviewed and approved in writing by CDFG prior to recordation for the purpose of confirming consistency. The purpose of the conservation easement(s) shall be to preserve the value of the land as foraging habitat for the Swainson's hawk.* | |
| 4.6-7 Potential Impacts to Tree Removal. | S | *4.6-7(a)* *Prior to commencement of construction-related activities for the project including, but not limited to, grading, staging of materials, or earthmoving activities, a tree preservation plan, in compliance with Ordinance 37.03.010 in the City of Davis Municipal Code, shall be submitted to the Community Development Department and City Arborist for review and approval, which shall ensure the following measures:*<br>• *Trees shall be cordoned off with chain link fence prior to construction as specified;*<br>• *Soil compaction under trees is to be avoided;*<br>• *The fence shall prevent equipment traffic and storage under the trees and should extend beyond the drip-line;*<br>• *Excavation within this zone shall be* | LS |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | *accomplished by hand, and roots ½" and larger shall be preserved;*<br>• *Proper fertilization and irrigation prior to and during the construction period shall be provided as specified;*<br>• *New landscaping under existing trees shall be carefully planned to avoid any grade changes and any excess moisture in trunk area. Existing plants which have compatible irrigation requirements and which complement the trees' color, texture and form are to be saved;*<br>• *Trenching within the drip-line shall be performed only with prior approval of the Park and General Services Department. Boring is preferred when feasible;*<br>• *All paving plans and specifications shall clearly prohibit the use of soil sterilants adjacent to preserved trees; and*<br>• *Grade changes greater than one foot within the drip-line shall be avoided, and nothing other than a saw shall be used for root cutting.*<br><br>*4.6-7(b) Prior to commencement of construction-related activities for the project including, but not limited to, grading, staging of materials, or earthmoving activities, a sheet shall be included with the project plans, which indicates all of the trees identified. The tree report with corresponding descriptions of each tree by species,* | |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | *health, etc. should also be included. In addition, notes shall be included on the plans which clearly state protection procedures for trees that are to be preserved. Any tree care practices, such as cutting of roots, pruning the top, etc., shall be adequately described and shall have the approval of a representative of the Parks and General Services Department prior to execution. In the event of damage to existing trees, a penalty clause shall be replacement tree(s) of equal size in D.B.H. unless specified otherwise by the Parks and General Services Department.*<br><br>*4.6-7(c)* *Trees identified on the site as Trees of Significance, that are proposed for removal, shall be replaced either on site or at a nearby site deemed acceptable by the Director of the City of Davis Parks and General Services Department. The Director may require an in-lieu fee to be paid to the City of Davis Tree Preservation Fund instead of or in addition to tree replacement. The recommendations for avoidance of trees contained in Chapter 37 of the City of Davis Municipal Code (Tree Planting, Preservation, and Protection) should be adopted if feasible. If infeasible, the applicant should identify trees slated for removal on the site plan, including those with encroachments within 30-feet of the drip line of trees and develop a tree replacement plan that shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to issuance of the grading permit. Tree replacement shall be implemented according to options outlined in Section* | |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | *37.03.070 of the City's Municipal Code as follows:*<br><br>*(i) Replanting a tree(s) on site: Trees shall be planted in number and size so that there is no net loss in tree diameter at breast height (DBH). For example, if one tree is removed with a 12-inch DBH size, mitigation may consist of a replacement of equal size, two trees each 6-inch DBH, or four trees each 3-inch DBH. The replanted tree(s) shall be minimum 5 gallon size and of a species that will eventually equal or exceed the removed tree in size.*<br>*(ii) Replanting a tree(s) off site: If there is insufficient space on the property for the replacement tree(s), required planting shall occur on other property in the applicant's ownership or in City-owned open space or park, subject to the approval of the City Arborist and authorized property owners.*<br>*(iii)Payment to the Tree Preservation Fund in lieu of replacement: If in the City Arborist's determination no feasible alternative exists to plant the required mitigation, or there are other considerations for alternative mitigation, the applicant shall pay into the Tree Preservation Fund an amount determined by the Director based upon the ISA appraisal guidelines or other approved method. If the Director approves another method of appraisal guideline, the* | |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | *Director shall publish notice of that approval and notify the permit applicant at the time the permit application is issued.* | |
| 4.6-8 | Cumulative loss of biological resources in the City of Davis and the effects of ongoing urbanization in the region. | LS | *4.6-8* | *None required.* | N/A |
| **4.7 Aesthetics** | | | | | |
| 4.7-1 | Impacts related to altering the existing character of the project site and obstructing views from existing homes. | S | *4.7-1* | *None feasible.* | SU |
| 4.7-2 | Impacts related to light and glare. | S | *4.7-2(a)* | *Prior to issuance of the first building permit, the developer shall submit a street lighting plan for review and approval by the City Engineer. Street lightning shall be limited to reduced height low-profile fixtures. The Plan shall comply with Chapter 6 of the Davis Municipal Code- Article VIII: Outdoor Lighting Control.* | LS |
| | | | *4.7-2(b)* | *Prior to the issuance of building permits, the developer shall submit a lighting plan for the review and approval of the Chief Building Official of the City of Davis. The lighting plan shall include shielding on all light fixtures and shall address-limiting light trespass and glare through the use of shielding and directional lighting methods, including but not limited to, fixture location and height. The Plan shall comply with Chapter 6 of the* | |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| | Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | *Davis Municipal Code- Article VIII: Outdoor Lighting Control.* | |
| 4.7-3 | Impacts to scenic resources. | LS | *4.7-3* | *None required.* | N/A |
| 4.7-4 | Long-term impacts to the visual character of the region from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Davis area. | S | *4.7-4* | *None feasible.* | SU |
| **4.8 Hydrology, Water Quality, and Drainage** | | | | | |
| 4.8-1 | Exposure of people and structures to flood hazards on the project site. | LS | *4.8-1* | *None required.* | N/A |
| 4.8-2 | Increased stormwater runoff from the project site contributing to downstream flooding. | S | *4.8-2* | *In conjunction with the submittal of a tentative map, the project applicant shall submit a design-level engineering report on the stormwater detention and conveyance system to the City Engineer demonstrating that the proposed project peak flows into the existing 36-inch storm drain would not exceed 6.2 cfs. The report shall also demonstrate that peak flows from the site do not coincide with peak flows within Channel "A" and demonstrate how the system would function to adequately treat stormwater runoff prior to being discharged into Channel "A." Stormwater detention and conveyance plans shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.* | LS |
| 4.8-3 | Construction-related impacts to surface water quality. | S | *4.8-3* | *Prior to commencement of construction, the applicant shall obtain a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity* | LS |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| | Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | *(Construction General Permit), which pertains to pollution from grading and project construction. Compliance with the Permit requires the project applicant to file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prior to ground disturbance. The SWPPP would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) in order to prevent, or reduce to the greatest extent feasible, adverse impacts to water quality from erosion and sedimentation. A copy of the SWPP including BMP implementation provisions shall be submitted to the Chief Building Official.* | |
| 4.8-4 | Long-term water quality degradation associated with urban runoff from the project site. | LS | *4.8-4* | *None required.* | N/A |
| 4.8-5 | Long-term increases in peak stormwater runoff flows from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Davis area. | LS | *4.8-5* | *None required.* | N/A |
| 4.8-6 | Cumulative impacts related to degradation of water quality. | S | *4.8-5* | *Implement Mitigation Measures 4.8-2 and 4.8-3.* | LS |
| **4.9 Public Services and Facilities** | | | | | |
| 4.9-1 | Ability of Existing Water Conveyance Facilities to Meet | S | *4.9-1(a)* | *Prior to issuance of building permits, the East Area Tank, the East Area Main Upsize, and the West Area* | LS |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| | Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Project Water Demands. | | | *Main Upsize shall be included within the City's Capital Improvement Plan and fully funded for construction.* | |
| | | | *4.9-1(b)* | *If the following is not included in the City's water connection charge at the time the water charge is paid for any unit in the project, then, in addition to the water connection charge, the project shall pay fair share fees for the above-listed improvements at the time of building permit issuance. This fair share shall include any additional costs that the City may incur to accelerate the timing of the above-listed projects.* | |
| 4.9-2 | Long-term availability of water supply to meet the project water demand. | S | *4.9-2* | *The project applicant shall pay fair share fees for the future water supply project(s) required to meet City demand beyond 2020 at the time of building permit issuance.* | LS |
| 4.9-3 | Increased demand for wastewater disposal. | S | *4.9-3* | *Prior to the approval of a tentative map for the Wildhorse Ranch project, the applicant shall submit a design-level wastewater report for the proposed project that demonstrates how the project's wastewater will be delivered to the Wastewater Treatment Plant. Included in the report shall be a determination of the capacity of downstream sewer lines and what improvements, if any, need to be constructed to accommodate and convey the project's additional wastewater, and the construction and operational costs of the options. The wastewater report shall be subject to approval by the City Engineer. The applicant shall be required to fully fund and construct the necessary wastewater improvements determined by the wastewater report.* | LS |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4.9-4 | Increased demand for fire protection services. | S | *4.9-4* | *Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall contribute funds to the Davis Fire Department for the provision of facilities needed to provide adequate fire protection service to the proposed project. These facilities may include but are not necessarily limited to a fourth City fire station and a ladder truck. The amount of funding shall be determined by the Community Development Director and the Davis Fire Chief.* | SU |
| 4.9-5 | Increased demand for law enforcement protection services. | S | *4.9-5* | *Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant shall contribute funding to the Davis Police Department needed to provide an additional 0.57 officer. Funding options include, but are not necessarily limited to the following:*<br><br>*1) Provide an endowment fund that would provide for the hiring of approximately 60 percent law enforcement officer and the support equipment and materials for the officer;*<br>*2) Contribute toward hiring new officers, their equipment and materials with the goal of improving community relations as a good steward of the community; or*<br>*3) The project applicant shall present an alternative and acceptable means, as determined by the Police Chief, whereby the required law enforcement officer will be provided in the long-term.* | LS |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | *The final funding mechanism and dollar amount shall be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Director and the Davis Police Chief.* | |
| 4.9-6 | Increased demand for school resources. | S | *4.9-6* | *Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall show proof to the Community Development Department of payment of current SB50 and AB 16 school impacts fees.* | LS |
| 4.9-7 | Increased demand for solid waste disposal/recycling services. | LS | *4.9-7* | *None required.* | N/A |
| 4.9-8 | Increased demand for park and recreation services and facilities. | S | *4.9-8* | *Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall pay in-lieu Quimby fees for required park acreage.* | LS |
| 4.9-9 | Impacts to gas and electric facilities. | LS | *4.9-9* | *None required.* | N/A |
| 4.9-10 | Long-term impacts to public services and facilities from the proposed project in combination with existing and future developments in the Davis area. | LS | *4.9-10* | *None required.* | N/A |
| **4.10 Climate Change** | | | | | |
| 4.10-1 | Project impacts concerning the production of GHGs. | S | *4.10-1* | *In conjunction with the submittal of a Tentative Map for the proposed project, the project applicant shall submit, for the review and approval of the Community Development Department, a sustainability plan, which demonstrates that the proposed project does not conflict with the goals and strategies of Executive Order S-3-05, the Attorney General's suggested global warming mitigation measures, or City of Davis Resolution No.* | SU |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | *08-166. The sustainability plan shall include, but not be limited to, the compliance measures included in Table 4.10-6.* | |
| **Initial Study** | | | |
| V. Cultural Resources. | S | *V-1* *Prior to commencement of construction-related activities for the project including, but not limited to, grading, staging of materials, or earthmoving activities, an archaeological monitor shall be retained by the applicant and approved by the City to train the construction grading crew prior to commencement of earth-grading activity in regard to the types of artifacts, rock, bone, or shell that they are likely to find, and when work shall be stopped for further evaluation. One trained crew member shall be on-site during all earth moving activities, with the assigned responsibility of "monitor." If any earth-moving activities uncover artifacts, exotic rock, or unusual amounts of bone or shell, work shall be halted in the immediate area of the find and shall not be resumed until after the archaeologist monitor has inspected and evaluated the deposit and determined the appropriate means of curation. The appropriate mitigation measures may include as little as recording the resource with the California Archaeological Inventory database or as much as excavation, recordation, and preservation of the sites that have outstanding cultural or historic significance.* | LS |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | S | *V-2* | *Prior to the approval of tentative map(s), the tentative map(s) shall state that during construction, if bone is uncovered that may be human; the Native American Heritage Commission in Sacramento and the Yolo County Coroner shall be notified. Should human remains be found, the Coroner's office shall be immediately contacted and all work halted until final disposition by the Coroner. Should the remains be determined to be of Native American descent, the Native American Heritage Commission shall be consulted to determine the appropriate disposition of such remains.* | LS |
| VI Geology and Soils. | S | *VI-1* | *Prior to commencement of construction-related activities for the project including, but not limited to, grading, staging of materials, or earthmoving activities, the developer shall prepare a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), consistent with the State Water Resources Control Board NPDES requirements. A copy of the SWPPP shall be submitted to the City Engineer subject to review and comment.* | LS |
| | S | *VI-2* | *Prior to the approval of final map(s), a final design-level geotechnical report, with consideration of recommendations from the Wildhorse Geotechnical Investigation, shall be prepared and submitted to the Chief Building Official for review and comment. The recommendations of the final geotechnical report shall be incorporated into the project design prior to issuance of building permits for review and approval of the City Engineer and/or Chief Building Official.* | LS |

**TABLE 2-1**
**SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Impact | | Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation | Mitigation Measures | | Level of Significance After Mitigation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| VII | Hazards and Hazardous Materials. | S | *VII-1* | *Prior to commencement of construction-related activities for the project including, but not limited to, grading, staging of materials, or earthmoving activities, the on-site septic systems and agricultural well(s) shall be located and properly destroyed by a licensed contractor in compliance with Yolo County Environmental Health Department standards. Confirmation of the destruction of such facilities shall be submitted to the City Engineer.* | LS |