

CEQA requires an EIR to evaluate a project's effects in relationship to broader changes occurring, or that are foreseeable to occur, in the surrounding environment. Accordingly, this chapter presents discussion of CEQA-mandated analysis for cumulative impacts and irreversible impacts associated with the Cannery project. As described below and in greater detail in Section 3.7, this section does not include an analysis of discussion of the project's growth inducing impacts, per the CEQA streamlining provisions of SB 375 and Public Resources Code Section 21159.28.

4.1 CUMULATIVE SETTING AND IMPACT ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) contain an assessment of the cumulative impacts that could be associated with the proposed project. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(a), "an EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable." "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects (as defined by Section 15130). As defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15355, a cumulative impact consists of an impact that is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts. A cumulative impact occurs from:

...the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.

In addition, Section 15130(b) identifies that the following three elements are necessary for an adequate cumulative analysis:

1) Either:

(A) A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency; or,

(B) A summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact. Any such planning document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency.

- 2) A summary of the expected environmental effects to be produced by those projects with specific reference to additional information stating where that information is available; and
- 3) A reasonable analysis of the cumulative impacts of the relevant projects. An EIR shall examine reasonable, feasible options for mitigating or avoiding the project's contribution to any significant cumulative effects.

Where a lead agency is examining a project with an incremental effect that is not "cumulatively considerable," a lead agency need not consider that effect significant, but shall briefly describe its basis for concluding that the incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable.

CUMULATIVE SETTING

The cumulative analysis for this EIR is based on the City of Davis General Plan (May 2001) and the Program EIR for the City of Davis General Plan Update and Project EIR for Establishment of a New Junior High School (General Plan Update EIR) (January 2000). The cumulative traffic analysis was also based on full buildout of the UC Davis 2003 Long Range Development Plan. The traffic analysis also contained two separate scenarios with differing assumptions for development of the Covell Village project site, which is adjacent to the Cannery site. The first scenario assumed the adjacent Covell Village project site was developed with 1,200 housing units under cumulative conditions. The second scenario assumed the Covell Village project site was developed per its existing Yolo County zoning designation of Light Industrial (yielding 4.6 million square feet of space). These cumulative traffic scenarios and assumptions are described in greater detail in Section 3.14. Given that the air and noise analyses for the proposed project are based upon the traffic data prepared for the project, the air and noise cumulative settings include the same parameters as the traffic cumulative setting. Cumulative project impacts are addressed and summarized below.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS OF THE PROJECT

Method of Analysis

Although the environmental effects of an individual project may not be significant when that project is considered separately, the combined effects of several projects may be significant when considered collectively. State CEQA Guidelines 15130 requires a reasonable analysis of a project's cumulative impacts, which are defined as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." The cumulative impact that results from several closely related projects is: the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonable foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time (State CEQA Guidelines 15355[b]). Consistent with state CEQA Guidelines §15130(a), the discussion of cumulative impacts in this Draft EIR focuses on significant and potentially significant cumulative impacts. According to §15130(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, in

part, “The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness, and should focus on the cumulative impact to which the identified other projects contribute rather than the attributes of other projects which do not contribute to the cumulative impact.”

The goal of analysis of cumulative impacts is twofold: first, to determine whether the overall long-term impacts of all such projects would be cumulatively significant; and second, to determine whether the proposed project itself would cause a “cumulatively considerable” (and thus significant) incremental contribution to any such cumulatively significant impacts. (See state CEQA Guidelines §§15130[a]-[b], §15355[b], §15064[h], §15065[c]; *Communities for a Better Environment v. California Resources Agency* [2002] 103 Cal.App.4th 98, 120.) In other words, the required analysis first creates a broad context in which to assess the project’s incremental contribution to anticipated cumulative impacts, viewed on a geographic scale well beyond the project site itself, and then determines whether the proposed project’s incremental contribution to any significant cumulative impacts from all projects is itself significant (i.e., “cumulatively considerable”).

There are two approaches to identifying cumulative projects and the associated impacts. The list approach identifies individual projects known to be occurring or proposed in the surrounding area in order to potential cumulative impacts. The projection approach uses a summary of projections in adopted General Plans or related planning documents to identify potential cumulative impacts. This EIR uses a combination of the list approach and the projection approach for the cumulative analysis and considers the development anticipated to occur upon buildout of the Davis General Plan in addition to the two assumptions for cumulative conditions development of the Covell Village site, as identified above.

Project Assumptions

The project’s contribution to environmental impacts under cumulative conditions is based on full buildout of the proposed Cannery project site. See Chapter 2, Project Description, for a complete description of the proposed project.

Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts for most issue areas are not quantifiable and are therefore discussed in general terms as they pertain to development patterns in the surrounding region. Exceptions to this are traffic, noise and air quality (the latter two of which are associated with traffic volumes), which may be quantified by estimating future traffic patterns, pollutant emitters, etc. and determining the combined effects that may result. In consideration of the cumulative scenario described above, the proposed Cannery project may result in the following cumulative impacts.

AESTHETICS

Impact 4.1: The project may contribute to the cumulative degradation of the existing visual character of the region (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The cumulative setting for aesthetics is the Davis Planning Area, as defined in the City of Davis General Plan. Under cumulative conditions, buildout of the Davis General Plan would result in changes to the visual character of the Davis Planning Area and result in impacts to localized views as new development occurs within the City and the Planning Area.

As described in Section 3.1- Aesthetics, implementation of the proposed project would change the visual character of the project site by introducing urban land uses to an industrial site that is currently vacant. The project site was previously developed with industrial uses, and is currently designated for industrial uses by the Davis General Plan. As described in Section 3.1, project implementation would not result in significant adverse impacts to the visual character of the site. Project development would occur on a property that is within the Davis City limits, and is planned for development in the Davis General Plan. The project would not result in visual impacts beyond the boundary of the project site, and the aesthetic appears of the project would be consistent and compatible with the surrounding land uses within the City. This is **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

AGRICULTURE

Impact 4.2: The project may contribute to cumulative impact on agricultural Land and uses (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

As described in Section 3.2, the project site is not zoned or designated for agricultural uses. The project site is currently designated Industrial by the Davis General Plan Land Use Map, and is zoned Planned Development-Industrial (PD-1-00). There are no existing agricultural operations or activities on the project site. As described in greater detail of Section 2.0 of this Draft EIR, the project site was the previous home to the Hunt-Wesson Tomato Cannery, which operated from 1961 to 1999. The project site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

The northern half of the project site is designated as Farmland of Local Importance by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, as shown in Figure 3.2-1. While this portion of the project site is designated as Farmland of Local Importance by the California Department of Conservation, the entire project site is identified for urban uses by the City of Davis General Plan Land Use Map. Davis General Plan Policy AG 1.1 states: *“Protect agricultural land from urban development except where the general plan land use map has designated the land for urban uses.”* As stated above, the Davis General Plan Land Use Map designates the entire project site, including the northern portion of the project site, as Industrial land, which is an urban land use. Therefore, per the policies in the Davis General Plan, the project site is not considered agricultural land that requires protection from urban development. As further described in Section 3.2, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the direct or indirect conversion of adjacent agricultural lands to non-agricultural use. This is a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

AIR QUALITY

Impact 4.3: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on the region's air quality (Cumulatively Considerable and Significant and Unavoidable)

The cumulative setting for air quality impacts is the Sacramento Valley Air Basin. Under buildout conditions in the Davis General Plan, the Sacramento Valley Air Basin would continue to experience increases in criteria pollutants and efforts to improve air quality throughout the basin would be hindered. As described in Section 3.3, Yolo County has a state designation of Nonattainment for Ozone, and PM₁₀ and is either Attainment for all other criteria pollutants. The County has a national designation of Nonattainment for ozone and PM_{2.5} (partial non-attainment). The County is designated either attainment or unclassified for all other criteria pollutants. Table 3.3-2 presents the state and nation attainment status for Yolo County.

As discussed under Impact 3.3-1, the proposed project would result in increased emissions primarily from vehicle miles travelled associated with project implementation. The Yolo-Solano Air Pollution Control District has established an operational emissions threshold of significance for ozone precursors of 10 tons per year for ROG and NO_x, and 80 pounds per day for PM₁₀. As shown in Table 3.3-6, project generated emissions are above the YSAQMD 10 tons per year threshold for ROG and NO_x, and 80 pounds per day threshold for PM₁₀. Under cumulative conditions, mobile source emissions generated by the proposed project would contribute to the region's air pollution, and would exceed the thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants for which the region is in non-attainment status. Mitigation Measures 3.3-1 and 3.3-2 would reduce the severity of this impact, however, this impact would remain **cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable**.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Impact 4.4: The project may contribute to the cumulative loss of biological resources including habitats and special status species (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The cumulative setting for biological resources includes the City of Davis Planning Area and the greater Yolo County region. Development associated with implementation of the Davis General Plan would contribute to the ongoing loss of natural and agricultural lands in the Davis area, which currently provide habitat for a variety of species. Cumulative development would result in the conversion of existing agricultural habitat to urban uses. The Davis General Plan, in addition to regional, State and federal regulations, includes policies and measures that mitigate impacts to biological resources associated with General Plan buildout. Development outside of Davis in Yolo County, would also be subject to the same regional, State and federal regulations addressing sensitive species. Implementation of regional, State and federal regulations, such as the Endangered Species Act would also minimize risks to sensitive populations and reduce cumulative impacts throughout the region.

As described in Section 3.4- Biological Resources, construction on the project site has a limited potential to result in impacts to special-status species on the project site. There are no known special-status species on the project site, and the site does not provide unique or sensitive habitat

that is critical to the survival of a special-status species. As described in Section 3.4, mitigation measures will be implemented to ensure that construction activities do not adversely impact biological resources or special-status species. Project implementation would not result in any indirect or offsite impacts to biological resources. This is considered a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact 4.5: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on known and undiscovered cultural resources (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The cumulative setting for cultural resources includes the City of Davis Planning Area and the surrounding areas of Yolo County. Cumulative development anticipated in Davis and the greater Yolo County area, including growth projected by adopted general plans, may result in the discovery and removal of cultural resources, including archaeological, paleontological, historical, and Native American resources and human remains. As discussed in Section 3.5- Cultural Resources, there are no known cultural or historic resources present on the project site. Mitigation measures provided in Section 3.5 would require the proposed project to evaluate any resources discovered during construction activities. Any significant finds would be required to be preserved, either through relocation or documentation and the project is not anticipated to considerably contribute to a significant reduction in cultural resources. Therefore, the project would have a **less than cumulatively considerable** contribution to impacts to cultural resources and no further mitigation is required.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Impact 4.6: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on geologic and soils characteristics (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The cumulative setting area for geology and soils includes the City of Davis Planning Area. As discussed in Section 3.5- Geology and Soils, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to this environmental topic. Geologic and soils impacts tend to be site-specific and project-specific. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in increased risks or hazards related to geologic conditions in the cumulative setting area, nor would it result in any off-site or indirect impacts. This is considered to be a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact, and no further mitigation is required.

GREENHOUSE GASES AND CLIMATE CHANGE

Impact 4.7: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on greenhouse gases and climate change (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The cumulative setting for this issue (climate change) comprises anthropogenic (i.e., human-made) GHG emissions sources across the globe and no project alone would reasonably be expected to contribute to a noticeable incremental change to the global climate. However, legislation and executive orders on the subject of climate change in California have established a statewide context and process for developing an enforceable statewide cap on GHG emissions. Given the nature of environmental consequences from GHGs and global climate change, CEQA requires that

lead agencies consider evaluating the cumulative impacts of GHGs. Small contributions to this cumulative impact (from which significant effects are occurring and are expected to worsen over time) may be potentially considerable and, therefore, significant.

The analysis of GHGs and climate change included in Section 3.7 was conducted at the cumulative level, as described in greater detail in that EIR section. As noted in Section 3.7, the proposed project is consistent with the SACOG SCS, and as such, a quantitative analysis of GHG emissions from cars and light-duty trucks was not included, as provided for under Public Resources Code Section 21159.28. As described in Section 3.7, the proposed project is consistent with statewide, regional, and local planning efforts to reduce GHG emissions. The project is consistent with SACOG's SCS, the City of Davis CAAP, and the City's GHG Standards for New Residential Projects. As required by Mitigation Measures 3.7-1 and 3.7-2, the proposed project must include a range of measures to reduce emissions associated with the project, which would assist both the City of Davis and SACOG in meeting their adopted GHG reduction targets. As such, the proposed project would not directly or indirectly generate GHG emissions that would have a significant effect on the environment. This is a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact following the implementation of the above-referenced mitigation measures.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Impact 4.8: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The cumulative setting area for hazards and hazardous materials is the City of Davis Planning Area. As discussed in Section 3.8- Hazards and Hazardous Materials, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to this environmental topic. Hazard-related impacts tend to be site-specific and project-specific. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in increased risks of hazards in the cumulative setting area, nor would it result in any off-site or indirect impacts. Mitigation measures have been included to reduce the risk of on-site hazards associated with past industrial uses on the project site. This is considered to be a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact, and no further mitigation is required.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Impact 4.9: The project may contribute to cumulative increases in peak stormwater runoff flows from the project site (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

Implementation of the proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surfaces on the project site, which could increase peak stormwater runoff rates and volumes on and downstream of the site. However, the proposed project includes an extensive system of on-site stormwater collection, treatment and retention facilities to accommodate the increased stormwater flows that would originate on and off-site.

As indicated on page 5G-15 of the General Plan Update EIR, a proposed land use would be considered to have a significant impact if the new land use would "result in a substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in on- or off-site flooding; or create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned

stormwater drainage facilities.” The effect of the proposed project plus other development in the project area, leading to buildout of the General Plan, could be to increase stormwater flows to a degree that would exceed existing drainage system capacity and cause flooding downstream. As described in greater detail in Section 3.9, the proposed project would include a stormwater detention system that would ensure that the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable incremental increase in stormwater flows that would result in flooding downstream of the project site. Furthermore, future development within the City of Davis would be required to comply with City drainage plans and polices to ensure that each project would not cause a significant negative impact to other drainage facilities in the watershed. Although the final design of the storm drainage system is conceptual at this time, final storm drainage design would be reviewed by the City Engineer for consistency prior to implementation of the project. Therefore, a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact would result from implementation of the proposed project, following the implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.9-3.

Impact 4.10: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts related to degradation of water quality (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

Construction of the proposed project would contribute to a cumulative increase in urban pollutant loading, which would adversely affect water quality. Cumulative development in the Davis area, including the proposed project, would also result in increased impervious surfaces that could increase the rate and amount of runoff, thereby potentially adversely affecting existing surface water quality through increased erosion and sedimentation. The primary sources of water pollution include: runoff from roadways and parking lots; runoff from landscaping areas; non-stormwater connections to the drainage system; accidental spills; and illegal dumping. Runoff from roadway and parking lots could contain oil, grease, and heavy metals; additionally, runoff from landscaped areas could contain elevated concentrations of nutrients, fertilizers, and pesticides.

The mitigation measures for the project-specific impacts identified in Impact Statement 3.9-1 would reduce the pollutants in the stormwater from this project to a level lower than in the runoff from most developed areas within the Davis area, because most of these areas were constructed before stormwater quality BMPs were required. Additionally, future development projects would be required to implement BMPs comparable to the BMPs identified in this project. However, without implementation of proper BMPs, this project and other future projects would result in a continued decrease in the water quality of the local Davis natural drainage system. The implementation of Mitigation Measures 3.9-1 and 3.9-2, in addition to the BMPs and water quality protection features proposed by the project, as described in Section 2.0, would ensure that the project results in a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact to surface water quality.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

Impact 4.11: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on communities and local land uses (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The cumulative setting for land use and planning impacts includes the City of Davis and the Davis Planning Area. Cumulative land use and planning impacts, such as the potential for conflicts with adjacent land uses and consistency with adopted plans and regulations, are typically site- and

project-specific. Subsequent projects allowed by the Davis General Plan may result in site specific land use conflicts; however, these effects are not anticipated to be cumulatively considerable. Prior to project authorization, the City of Davis would amend the General Plan to designate the site for the land uses proposed by the project applicant. Implementation of the project, in combination with other proposed and future projects in the Planning Area, has the potential to create land use conflicts with existing uses. Generally, land use conflicts would be related to agricultural interface, noise, traffic, air quality, and safety issues which are discussed in the relevant sections of this document. Land use conflicts are site-specific and would not result in a cumulative impact. Incompatibility issues are generally addressed and mitigated on a project-by-project basis. The proposed project has been designed to be consistent with applicable aspects of the City's General Plan, and as described in this EIR, the project would not be incompatible with any of the surrounding land uses. The project's contribution to cumulative land use impacts is **less than cumulatively considerable**, and no further mitigation is required.

NOISE

Impact 4.12: The project may contribute to the cumulative exposure of existing and future noise-sensitive land uses or to increased noise resulting from cumulative development (Cumulatively Considerable and Significant and Unavoidable)

The cumulative context for noise impacts associated with the Proposed Project consists of the existing and future noise sources that could affect the project or surrounding uses. Noise generated by construction would be temporary, and would not add to the permanent noise environment or be considered as part of the cumulative context. The total noise impact of the Proposed Project would be fairly small and would not be a substantial increase to the existing future noise environment.

TRAFFIC

Cumulative noise impacts would occur primarily as a result of increased traffic on local roadways due to the proposed project and other projects within the area. Tables 3.11-14 and 3.11-15 show cumulative traffic noise levels with and without the proposed project. Cumulative noise impacts for the project are based on two different cumulative scenarios. Under the first cumulative scenario, the Covell Village site (located east of the project site) would be developed as residential under cumulative conditions. Under the second cumulative scenario, the Covell Village site would be developed as light industrial under cumulative conditions. Table 3.11-14 shows the cumulative noise levels comparing cumulative no project conditions (with Covell Village developed) as residential to cumulative conditions that include development of the proposed project. Table 3.11-15 shows the cumulative noise levels comparing cumulative no project conditions (with Covell Village developed as light industrial) to cumulative conditions that include development of the proposed project.

Under cumulative conditions, there would not be significant increases in noise levels compared to the no project conditions. However, the 60, 65 and 70 dB Ldn contours would extend farther under cumulative conditions and potentially impact additional sensitive receptors. As shown, the proposed project would contribute no more than 1.1 dB Ldn to noise levels on roadways fronting

4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

residential uses along the study area roadways. Additionally, the project would not cause new exceedances of the City of Davis 60 dB Ldn exterior noise level standard. Therefore, the project would not have a considerable contribution to potentially significant cumulative traffic noise impacts.

NON-TRAFFIC NOISE

The proposed project is not expected to create substantial non-traffic noise. Non-traffic noise includes increase pedestrian activity from the additional residential and business uses of the site. The number of people walking and interacting on surrounding roads would increase. This could raise noise levels on these streets slightly as more people utilize amenities in the area. This is not expected to substantially influence interior or exterior noise levels at nearby receptors. Mechanical equipment installed for heating, cooling, ventilation, and power supply would be placed indoors or shielded by mechanical barriers and/or rooftop parapets. Any noise from this equipment is not likely to generated substantial amounts of noise off the project site. Consequently, this would not add to any cumulative noise levels and would result in a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative stationary noise levels.

TRAIN WARNING HORN NOISE

As discussed under Impact 3.11-4, although the predicted railroad noise levels would comply with the City's conditionally acceptable 65 dB Ldn exterior noise level standard at new sensitive receptors, increased railroad noise due to warning horn usage would be significant at existing receptors located along the CNFR railroad line. Based upon the Table 3.11-4 data, existing receptors located along F Street, north of Covell Blvd. are currently exposed to exterior noise levels of approximately 62.4 dB Ldn. These receptors are located approximately 185 feet from the CNFR railroad centerline. At this distance railroad noise levels are predicted to be 63.5 dB Ldn. This would result in a combined exterior traffic and railroad noise level of 66.0 dB Ldn, an increase of 3.6 dB. This would exceed the project's significance criteria of 3 dB where existing noise levels are between 60 and 65 dB Ldn. Additionally, because individual warning horn soundings would result in clear and substantial temporary increases in ambient noise levels, the potential for adverse public reaction would exist, particularly during nighttime hours. The implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.11-2 has the potential to reduce this impact. However, as described previously in this chapter, the City cannot fully guarantee this measure. Therefore, this is considered to be a **cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable impact**.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Impact 4.13: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on population growth and the city's jobs:housing balance (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

As described in Section 3.12, growth in the City of Davis is limited by the 1% Growth Policy, which implements General Plan Policy LU 1.1 and associated Actions d and e. The City's 1% Growth Policy would allow approximately 259 dwelling units per year, based on the DOF estimate of 25,908 units in 2012. While the number of units proposed by The Cannery exceeds the number of units allowed to be constructed in a given year, the 1% Growth Policy includes provisions to accommodate larger

projects. The 1% Growth Policy requires larger projects (such as 100 or more units) to use a development agreement or a metered allocation system to phase units. The City's Housing Element, in discussing constraints to growth, identifies that larger projects such as the Lewis Cannery Project (which references the proposed project site while under previous ownership) would include provisions for phasing development through a development agreement.

The 1% Growth Policy also includes provisions to allow for extraordinary projects, which provides the City Council the ability to allow an infill project that provides for particular community needs with extraordinary community benefits even if the project would exceed the growth guideline of 1%.

In the event that the rate of growth associated with the proposed project is not regulated by a development agreement and the City Council did not determine that the project is an "extraordinary project," the project would be subject to the City's Phased Allocation Ordinance.

The City's requirements associated with the 1% Growth Policy and the City's Phased Allocation Ordinance would ensure that the population growth associated with the project is consistent with the City's growth management requirements. The project is also consistent with the regional growth projections prepared by SACOG.

Additionally, as described in Section 3.12, implementation of the proposed project would assist the City in moving towards the City's desired jobs:housing ratio. The proposed project would have a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact on population growth and the jobs:housing balance.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Impact 4.14: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on public services (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

Implementation of the proposed project would contribute toward an increased demand for public services and facilities within the City of Davis. Public service and facility needs for the City of Davis have been evaluated in the Davis General Plan, and the goals and policies included in the General Plan ensure that adequate services will be available for build-out of the General Plan according to the current Land Use Diagram. The current Land Use Diagram shows the project site as Industrial. Therefore, development of the project site with residential and commercial uses would exceed the demand for public services and facilities anticipated in the Davis General Plan. However, as demonstrated in this Draft EIR, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, impacts to public services and facilities as a result of the proposed project would be less-than-significant. Therefore, the project's cumulative contribution to the City's public service and facility needs would be **less than cumulatively considerable**. Furthermore, other future development projects would be required by the City to pay their fair share fees toward the expansion and creation of public services and facilities. Therefore, although certain facilities would be adversely impacted as a result of project implementation, cumulative impacts associated with public services and facilities would be considered less-than-significant with mitigation incorporated.

Impact 4.15: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on fire response times (Cumulatively Considerable and Significant and Unavoidable)

As described under Impact 3.13-2 in Section 3.13, the City of Davis General Plan Policy POLFIRE 1.2 requires the City to “develop and maintain the capacity to reach all areas of the City with...fire service within a five-minute emergency response time, 90% of the time.” Based on response time maps prepared by the Fire Department, the southern boundary of the project site is located within a four minute drive time of Station 31. With dispatch, turnout, and travel time, the project site is estimated to be within a 6-7 minute response time of Station 31. The estimated 6-7 minute response time is also applicable to numerous areas within the City and the City Council has directed the Fire Department to pursue planning for a fourth fire station to improve five minute response time coverage. A fourth fire station was included in the Covell Village project located immediately adjacent to the project site. The Covell Village project, including the fourth fire station, failed to obtain approval through a special election held on November 8, 2005.

The General Plan EIR concluded that the fire protection infrastructure was inadequate to maintain fire service standards. The City Council found that fire response times would remain deficient until such time as a fourth fire station is constructed to serve the northern portion of the City of Davis, which includes the project site. The Davis City Council adopted Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations that found that the specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations supported approval of the General Plan despite the significant and unavoidable impact. Therefore, consistent with the analysis of the Davis General Plan and General Plan EIR, the proposed project would have a **cumulatively considerable and significant and unavoidable** impact to fire protection services. This impact would be reduced when, or if, the City builds a fourth fire station to serve the northern portion of the city in accordance with the General Plan.

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Impact 4.16: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on the transportation network (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

As noted in section 3.14.2, two separate cumulative “no project” scenarios were analyzed in recognition of the uncertainty of what may be developed on the adjacent Covell Village property. One scenario assumes that site is developed with 1,200 single-family dwelling units. The other scenario assumes the site is developed with 4.6 million square feet of light industrial space, which was calculated based on a 25 percent floor-to-area ratio for the 422-acre property. Trips associated with Cannery Park were then added to each of these no project scenarios to yield two “cumulative plus project” scenarios.

The residential development scenario for Covell Village would generate about 1,210 AM peak hour trips and 1,250 PM peak hour trips prior to any adjustments for external trips made by walking, bicycle, or transit. The light industrial development scenario for Covell Village would generate 1,740 AM peak hour trips and 1,610 PM peak hour trips. This suggests that the cumulative scenario assuming light industrial for Covell Village will have greater levels of traffic on surrounding streets, and potentially degraded intersection operations compared to the residential scenario.

Based on the results in Table 3.14-9 and the signal warrant evaluations, project implementation would worsen already unacceptable (i.e., LOS F) cumulative operations to a significant degree at the following intersections:

- 8th Street/J Street – project traffic would cause the Peak Hour Signal warrant to be met;
- Covell Boulevard/L Street – The Peak Hour Signal warrant would already be met, and project traffic would increase the volume by more than one percent (10% during the AM peak hour and 9% during the PM peak hour);
- Covell Boulevard/Oak Tree Plaza Driveway – The Peak Hour Signal warrant would already be met, and project traffic would increase the volume by more than one percent (10% during the AM peak hour and 9% during the PM peak hour);
- Pole Line Road/Picasso Avenue– The Peak Hour Signal warrant would already be met, and project traffic would increase the volume by more than one percent (3% during the AM and PM peak hours); and
- Pole Line Road/Moore Boulevard – The Peak Hour Signal warrant would already be met, and project traffic would increase the volume by more than one percent (2% during the AM and PM peak hours).

This is a **significant impact**.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Mitigation Measure 3.14-2: *The project applicant(s) should contribute fair share funding to cover their proportionate cost of the following intersection improvements:*

- 8th Street/J Street (Covell Village as Residential or Light Industrial) – Install a traffic signal along with a dedicated westbound left-turn pocket. Operations would improve to LOS E or better with this mitigation measure in place.
- Pole Line Road/Picasso Avenue (Covell Village as Residential or Light Industrial) – install a traffic signal along with lane configurations shown on Figure 3.14-9B. Operations would improve to LOS E or better with this mitigation measure in place.
- Pole Line Road/Moore Boulevard (Covell Village as Residential or Light Industrial) – install a traffic signal along with lane configurations shown on Figure 3.14-9B. Operations would improve to LOS E or better with this mitigation measure in place.
- Covell Boulevard/L Street (Covell Village as Residential) – install a traffic signal along with lane configurations shown on Figure 3.14-9B, plus a dedicated westbound right-turn lane. Operations would improve to LOS E or better with this mitigation measure in place under the cumulative plus project with Covell Village as Residential scenario.

The cumulative plus project with Light Industrial scenario consists of a large volume of eastbound left-turns (650 AM peak hour vehicles). To avoid safety and operational problems (i.e., LOS F

4.0 OTHER CEQA-REQUIRED TOPICS

during the AM peak hour), a second left-turn lane would be warranted and is supported by General Plan Policy MOB 1.1. Thus, the following mitigation measure applies for the Light Industrial Scenario:

- Covell Boulevard/L Street (Covell Village as Light Industrial) – install a traffic signal along with lane configurations shown on Figure 3.14-9B, plus a dedicated westbound right-turn lane, and a second eastbound left-turn lane. Operations would improve to LOS E or better with this mitigation measure in place under the cumulative plus project with Covell Village as Light Industrial scenario.

Mitigation Measures 3.14-1A through 1F describe several potential mitigation strategies for the Covell Boulevard/Oak Tree Plaza Driveway intersection. These same mitigation options may be considered for cumulative conditions. However, increases in through traffic on Covell Boulevard under cumulative conditions will cause greater delays to the Oak Tree Plaza driveway approach. This would cause Mitigation Measure 3.14-1B (median refuge island) to result in LOS F conditions, whereas operations were at LOS E under existing plus project conditions.

The City may wish to consider roundabouts on Pole Line Road at either Picasso Avenue or Moore Boulevard. As noted in the *Covell Village Draft EIR (2004)*, roundabouts may require right-of-way acquisition. Analysis of roundabouts at these locations would result in LOS E or better operations at the Pole Line Road/Picasso Avenue intersection. The Pole Line Road/Moore Boulevard roundabout (with a single circulating lane) would operate at an unacceptable LOS F.

SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

All improvements (potentially excluding roundabouts) can either be constructed within the existing right-of-way or can be completed by widening along the frontage of the Covell Village property. Furthermore, all above improvements would result in an acceptable LOS. Finally, the proposed project and Covell Village are the two major planned projects that contribute to the need for these improvements. As such, fair share contributions by both projects are a viable mitigation strategy. However, development of the Covell Village property would require annexation of the property into the City of Davis, along with a favorable vote by the electorate under Measure J/Measure R. As a result, the potential for development of the Covell Village site, and the timing of such development if it were to be approved, is unknown. If the Covell Village property does not develop as described in this analysis, the cumulative impacts described would not occur. This is considered a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact after mitigation.

UTILITIES

Impact 4.17: The project may contribute to cumulative impacts on utilities (Less than Cumulatively Considerable)

The cumulative setting for utilities includes the City of Davis Planning Area. Under General Plan buildout conditions, the City of Davis would see an increased demand for water service, sewer service, solid waste disposal services, and stormwater infrastructure needs.

As described under Impact 3.15-1, there is currently adequate capacity at the City's WWTP to receive and treat all of the wastewater generated by the proposed project in addition to future development under cumulative conditions. Project implementation would not result in the need for new or expanded WWTP facilities, and would not exceed the existing or projected capacity of the City's WWTP. Therefore, the project's cumulative impact to wastewater services is **less than cumulatively considerable**, and no additional mitigation is required.

As described under Impact 3.15-2, the potable water demands for the Proposed Project, together with the City's existing water demands and projected future water demands, are within the water demand projections included in the City's 2011 UWMP. Potable water would be provided from the City's municipal water supply. As demonstrated by the analysis in Section 3.13 and under Impact 3.15-3, there are adequate water supplies to serve cumulative demand within the City, and the proposed project would result in **less than cumulatively considerable** impacts to water supplies.

As described in greater detail in Section 3.9, the proposed project would include a stormwater detention system that would ensure that the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable incremental increase in stormwater flows that would result in flooding downstream of the project site. Furthermore, future development within the City of Davis would be required to comply with City drainage plans and polices to ensure that each project would not cause a significant negative impact to other drainage facilities in the watershed. This is a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

As described under Impact 3.15-3, all non-recyclable waste generated by the City of Davis is disposed of at the 722-acre Yolo County Central Landfill, which is located off County Road 28H near its intersection with County Road 104. The landfill is owned and operated by the Yolo County Department of Public Works and Transportation. As described in the Yolo County General Plan Draft EIR (Yolo County, April 2009), the Central Landfill is a Class III solid waste landfill which provides comprehensive solid waste and recycling services, including municipal solid waste, recycling, salvaging, household hazardous waste, and business hazardous waste. Permitted maximum disposal ("throughput") at the Central Landfill is 1,800 tons per day. The total permitted capacity of the landfill is 49,035,200 cubic yards. At the current waste disposal rate (also assuming a diversion rate of 70 percent, no large increase of waste from outside the County, and future waste cells operated as bioreactors (described previously) the landfill's closure date is estimated to be January 1, 2081.

The proposed project would be required to comply with applicable state and local requirements including those pertaining to solid waste, construction waste diversion, and recycling. Specifically, Chapter 32 of the City's Municipal Code regulates the management of garbage, recyclables, and other wastes. Chapter 32 sets forth solid waste collection and disposal requirements for residential and commercial customers, and addresses yard waste, hazardous materials, recyclables, and other forms of solid waste.

As previously described, permitted maximum disposal at the Central Landfill is 1,800 tons per day. The total permitted capacity of the landfill is 49,035,200 cubic yards, which is expected to accommodate an operational life of about 68 years (January 1, 2081). The addition of the volume

of 7.4 tons/day of solid waste generated by the proposed project to the Yolo County Central Landfill would not exceed the landfill's remaining capacity. This is a **less than cumulatively considerable** impact.

4.2 GROWTH-INDUCING EFFECTS

INTRODUCTION

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR evaluate the growth-inducing impacts of a proposed action. A growth-inducing impact is defined by the CEQA Guidelines as:

The way in which a proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth...It is not assumed that growth in an area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

Section 15126 of the CEQA Guidelines identifies criteria for evaluating the extent to which growth could be induced, accelerated, intensified, or shifted as a result of the proposed project. Subsection (d) provides the framework for a discussion of these potential growth-inducing impacts, as follows:

- Would the project foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing?
- Would the project remove obstacles to population growth?
- Would the project tax existing community facilities?
- Would the project encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively?

On April 19, 2012, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) adopted its Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), as required by Senate Bill (SB) 375 as part of the concurrent update of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). As required by SB 375, the adopted SCS promotes and encourages development in areas defined by SACOG as Transit Priority Areas (TPAs). TPAs are areas of the region within one-half mile of a major transit stop (existing or planned light rail, street car, or train station) or an existing or planned high-quality transit corridor included in the MTP/SCS.

SB 375 establishes CEQA streamlining incentives to assist and encourage residential and mixed-use housing projects consistent with the SCS, and in particular, projects within TPAs. The CEQA streamlining benefits available under SB 375 are for residential and residential mixed-use projects that are consistent with the general plan land use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in the SCS. Under SB 375 an EIR prepared for a project that is consistent with the SCS is not required to reference, describe, or discuss (1) growth-inducing impacts; or (2) project specific or cumulative impacts from cars and light-duty truck trips

on global climate change or the regional transportation network if the project incorporates the mitigation measures required by an applicable prior environmental document. In addition, an EIR prepared for an SCS-consistent project is not required to reference, describe, or discuss a reduced residential density alternative to address the effects of car and light-duty truck trips generated by the project, as described under Public Resources Code Section 21159.28.

As described in greater detail in Section 3.7- Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change, the proposed project is consistent with SACOG's SCS, and as such, this EIR does not include an analysis of potential impacts related to growth inducement. As it relates to the adjacent Covell Village property, approval of the project is not likely to result in growth inducing impacts on that parcel. The project will not be extending infrastructure connections to the Covell Village property, or constructing oversized infrastructure to accommodate eventual demands from development on Covell Village. While project approval may spur the owners of the Covell Village site to propose future development plans for that site, development will require annexation of that property into the City of Davis, along with a favorable vote by the electorate under Measure J/Measure R.

4.3 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE EFFECTS

Legal Considerations

CEQA Section 15126.2(c) and Public Resources Code Sections 21100(b)(2) and 21100.1(a), requires that the EIR include a discussion of significant irreversible environmental changes which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented. Irreversible environmental effects are described as:

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

Determining whether the proposed project would result in significant irreversible effects requires a determination of whether key resources would be degraded or destroyed such that there would be little possibility of restoring them. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

Analysis

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the development of a residential mixed-use project on 100.1 acres of vacant land that is currently designated Industrial by the Davis General Plan. This property was previously used for industrial purposes (the Hunt/Wesson tomato cannery). Development of the proposed project would constitute a long-term commitment to residential and commercial mixed uses. It is unlikely that circumstances would arise that would justify the return of the land to its original condition as industrial land.

A variety of resources, including land, energy, water, construction materials, and human resources would be irretrievably committed for the project's initial construction, infrastructure installation and connection to existing utilities, phased buildout, and its continued maintenance. Construction of the project would require the commitment of a variety of other non-renewable or slowly renewable natural resources such as lumber and other forest products, sand and gravel, asphalt, petrochemicals, and metals.

Additionally, a variety of resources would be committed to the ongoing operation and life of the proposed project. The introduction of new residential and commercial mixed uses to the site will result in an increase in area traffic over existing conditions. Fossil fuels are the principal source of energy and the project will increase consumption of available supplies, including gasoline. These energy resource demands relate to initial project construction, project operation and site maintenance and the transport of people and goods to and from the project site.

4.4 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b) requires an EIR to discuss unavoidable significant environmental effects, including those that can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance. The following significant and unavoidable impacts of the Cannery Project are discussed in Chapters 3.1 through 3.15 (project-level) and previously in this chapter (cumulative-level).

- Impact 3.3-1: Project implementation may result in substantial increases in criteria pollutants from project operations.
- Impact 3.3-6 and 4.3: Project implementation may result in cumulative air quality impacts.
- Impact 3.11-4 and 4.12: The project may result in transportation noise at sensitive receptors
- Impact 3.13-2 and 4.15: Project implementation could result in significant impacts by placing new homes in areas outside of acceptable fire response times.

Impact 3.14-1: Project implementation would result in a significant impact at the unsignalized Covell Boulevard/Oak Tree Plaza Driveway Intersection (#20) (Significant and Unavoidable).