

ERRATA TO THE UC DAVIS 2018 LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN DRAFT EIR (MAY 22, 2018)

After Volume 3 of the Draft EIR was produced, the University identified that two pages were not included in the final production of the print files and website files. These missing pages are attached here and are pages 4-14 and 4-15 of Volume 3.

4.4 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

Table 4-1 summarizes the environmental analyses provided above for the project alternatives.

Table 4-1 Comparison of the Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives in Relation to the Orchard Park Redevelopment Component

Environmental Topic	Orchard Park Redevelopment	Alternative 1 No Project	Alternative 2 Reduced Development	Alternative 3 Higher Density Student Housing
Aesthetics	LTS/M	<	=	>
Agricultural Resources	NI	=	=	=
Air Quality	LTS/M	<	<	>
Archaeological, Historical, and Tribal Cultural Resources	LTS/M	<	=	=
Biological Resources	LTS/M	<	=	=
Energy	LTS	<	<	>
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	LTS/M	<	=	=
Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change	LTS	<	<	>
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	LTS/M	<	=	=
Hydrology and Water Quality	LTS/M	<	=	=
Land Use and Planning	LTS	<	=	=
Noise	LTS/M	<	=	=
Population and Housing	LTS	>	>	<
Public Services	LTS	<	=	=
Recreation	LTS	=	=	=
Transportation, Circulation, and Parking	SU	<	<	>
Utilities and Service Systems	LTS/M	<	=	=

Impact Status:

LTS = Less Than Significant Impact

= - Impacts would be similar to those of the project.

LTS/M = LTS with Mitigation

< - Impacts would be less than those of the project.

SU = Significant and Unavoidable

> - Impacts would be greater than those of the project.

Source: Data compiled by Ascent Environmental in 2018

4.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6 states that an EIR should identify the “environmentally superior” alternative. “If the environmentally superior alternative is the ‘no project’ alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.” As shown in the Executive Summary chapter of this volume of the EIR, there would be significant impacts associated with the project. These impacts are related to aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, cultural resources, biological resources, geology and soils, hazards, hydrology, noise, traffic, and utilities. Each of the alternatives presented would result in lesser environmental impacts

than the 2018 LRDP in certain areas while greater impacts in other areas, primarily because of differences in the level and type of development. None of the alternatives presented would only reduce impacts associated with the 2018 LRDP.

When considering objectives, the Orchard Park Redevelopment component would best meet the purpose and need. In contrast, Alternative 1 would not provide additional housing to accommodate any growth in student enrollment. Alternative 2 would not provide additional on-campus housing to the degree of the Orchard Park component and assist in UC Davis achieving the goals of the 2018 LRDP. While Alternative 3 would achieve a greater level of on-campus student housing than envisioned by the 2018 LRDP, it would likely increase the overall scale of campus development and further intensify construction activities within central campus and result in higher construction costs that could decrease affordability for UC Davis students. Because the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) would represent the least amount of development compared to existing conditions and thus, least potential physical environmental impacts, Alternative 1 would be considered the environmentally superior alternative.

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15126.6 [e][2]), because the environmentally superior alternative was identified as the No Project Alternative, another environmentally superior alternative shall be identified. Based on the environmental analysis contained in this Draft EIR, Alternative 2 would result in less impacts compared to the Orchard Park component but not to a degree of eliminating any significant impacts. However, Alternative 2 would result in potentially greater impacts to population and housing, as implementation of the 2018 LRDP with Alternative 2 may necessitate the construction of additional student housing elsewhere, which could result in additional environmental effects.

In conclusion, the environmentally superior alternative would be either the Orchard Park Redevelopment component or Alternative 2, depending on decisions about the priority of types of environmental benefits and adverse effects by UC Davis. Therefore, the environmental impact differences between these two alternatives are not substantial enough that one is clearly superior over the others.