

## 4.0

## INTRODUCTION TO THE ANALYSIS

### INTRODUCTION

---

Chapter 4 analyzes the potential impacts of the Second Street Crossing (Target Store) Project on a range of environmental issue areas. Subchapters 4.1 through 4.11 describe the focus of the analysis, references and other data sources for the analysis, the environmental setting as it relates to the specific issue, project-specific impacts and mitigation measures, and cumulative impacts of the proposed project for each issue area. The format of each of these sections is described below.

### DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE

---

Under CEQA, a significant effect is defined as a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in the environment (Public Resources Code §21068). The Guidelines implementing CEQA direct that this determination be based on scientific and factual data. The specific criteria for determining the significance of a particular impact are identified within the impact discussion in each section, and are consistent with significance criteria set forth in the CEQA Guidelines.

### INITIAL STUDY

---

The Initial Study (see Appendix C) prepared for the Second Street Crossing (Target Store) Project as a part of this EIR includes a detailed environmental checklist addressing a range of technical environmental issues. For each technical environmental issue, the Initial Study identifies the level of impact for the proposed project. The Initial Study identifies the environmental effects as either “no impact,” “less-than-significant,” “potentially significant with mitigation incorporated,” and “potentially significant.” The Initial Study provided the following conclusions:

Impacts identified for the proposed project in the Initial Study as less-than-significant or nonexistent, which do not require mitigation, are presented below.

- *Agriculture Resources(II a-c. p.13):* The proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses, conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act contract, or involve other changes in the existing environment which could individually or cumulatively result in loss of Farmland to non-agricultural use.
- *Air Quality(III e. p.16):* The proposed project would not create objectionable odors.

- *Cultural Resources(V a. p.20)*: No structures exist on-site, therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on known historical resources.
- *Geology and Soils(VI ai-iv,c,e p.21-22)*: The project site is not susceptible to fault rupture, seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, lateral spreading, or subsidence. Furthermore, the proposed project has been designed to connect to existing sewer systems.
- *Hazards and Hazardous Materials(VII e, f, h pgs.25)* :The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of an airport, or located within an area where wildland fires occur. Therefore, the proposed project would result in no impacts pertaining to the aforementioned hazards.
- *Hydrology and Water Quality(VIII g-j pgs.28)*: The project site is not within a 100-year floodplain, nor is it located within an area subject to damage by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in no impact relating to these phenomena.
- *Land Use and Planning(IX a p.29)*: The proposed project would not divide an existing community.
- *Mineral Resources(X a-c p. 31-32)*: The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan or a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.
- *Noise(XI b,e,,f p. 33-34)*: The proposed project would not expose people to generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels nor would it expose people to excessive noise levels associated with airport uses.
- *Population and Housing(XII a-c pg.35)*: The proposed project would not directly induce population growth or displace existing housing or people because the site is not currently used for residential purposes. However, the Target Store as well as other future on-site uses would create new jobs that could attract additional residents to the City. These additional residents would not result in substantial growth incapable of being accommodated by existing homes and other infrastructure.
- *Public Services(XIII c,d p. 36-37)*: The proposed project would not induce population growth in the City of Davis and, therefore, would not require the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities.
- *Recreation(XIV a,b p. 38)*: The proposed project would not induce population growth in the City of Davis and, therefore, would not require the provision of new parks or recreational facilities.

- *Transportation and Circulation(XV c. p.40)*: The project site is not located near an airport, and the proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

Impacts identified for the proposed project in the Initial Study as less-than-significant which do require mitigation, are presented below.

- *Geology and Soils(VI b,d p.22-23)*: Construction of the proposed project could contribute to short-term impacts on surface water quality through increased turbidity and sediment loading and could potentially place structures on expansive soils. Although the impact would be considered potentially significant, implementation of the included mitigation measure would reduce the impact to less-than-significant.

All remaining issues were identified in the Initial Study as potentially significant and are discussed in this Draft EIR.

### **ISSUES ADDRESSED IN THIS DRAFT EIR**

---

The Initial Study identified several environmental impacts as potentially significant and required further analysis. This EIR provides the additional analysis necessary to address the technical environmental impacts not fully resolved in the Initial Study. Consistent with the conclusions of the Initial Study, the following environmental issues are addressed in this chapter of the Draft EIR:

- aesthetics
- land use;
- transportation and circulation;
- air quality;
- noise;
- cultural resources;
- biological resources;
- socio-economics;
- hazards;
- hydrology, water quality, and drainage;
- public services and facilities;

### **SECTION FORMAT**

---

Each section in Chapter 4 addressing a specific environmental issue begins with an **introduction** describing the purpose of the section. The introduction is followed by a description of the project's **environmental setting** as it pertains to that particular issue. The setting description is followed by the **regulatory context** and the **impacts and mitigation measures** discussion. This discussion contains the **significance criteria**, followed by the **methods of analysis**. The **impact and mitigation** discussion includes

impact statements prefaced by a number in bold-faced type. An explanation of each impact and an analysis of its significance follow each impact statement. All mitigation measures pertinent to each individual impact follow directly after the impact statement (see below). The degree of relief provided by identified mitigation measures is also evaluated. An example of the format is shown below:

#### **4.x-1 Statement of Impact**

Discussion of impact for the proposed project in paragraph format.

Statement of *level of significance* of impact prior to mitigation is included at the end of each impact discussion.

##### Mitigation Measure(s)

Statement of *level of significance* after the mitigation is included immediately preceding mitigation measures.

4.x-1(a)      *Recommended mitigation measure(s) presented in italics and numbered in consecutive order.*

4.x-1(b)      *Mitigation Measure.*