

1 INTRODUCTION

On April 13, 2018, the University of California, Davis (UC Davis) released for public review the draft environmental impact report (Draft EIR) for the proposed 2018 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). In addition to the programmatic evaluation of the 2018 LRDP, the Draft EIR included project-level evaluations of the proposed West Village Expansion (Volume 2) and Orchard Park Redevelopment (Volume 3) components of the 2018 LRDP. The Draft EIR was prepared under the Board of Regents of the University of California's (The Regents') direction in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Sections 21000–21177) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Sections 15000–15387). The Regents is serving as the lead agency under CEQA for consideration of certification of this EIR and has principal responsibility for approving the 2018 LRDP and two project-level components.

1.1 PUBLIC REVIEW AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

In accordance with Sections 15087 and 15105 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment to responsible agencies, as well as members of the public, for 46 days (April 13, 2018, through May 29, 2018) (a 45-day review period is required under CEQA). UC Davis also held a public hearing on May 3, 2018, to receive comments on the Draft EIR. Comment letters received on the Draft EIR and a transcript of oral testimony provided at the public hearing are provided in their entirety in Chapter 2, “Comments and Responses to Comments.”

Responses to each of the comments received are provided in this document as part of the final environmental impact report (Final EIR). Although some of the comments have resulted in changes to the text of the Draft EIR (see Chapter 4, “Corrections and Revisions to the Draft EIR”), none of the changes constitute “significant new information,” which would require recirculation of the Draft EIR. “Significant new information” is defined in Section 15088.5(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines as follows:

- (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
- (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.
- (4) The Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

None of these circumstances has arisen from comments on the Draft EIR; therefore, recirculation is not required.

The Draft EIR, Final EIR, and associated appendices are available for review online at: <http://campustomorrow.ucdavis.edu> and at the following public libraries:

- ▲ Davis: Mary L. Stephens Branch Library, 315 East 14th Street, Davis, CA 95616

- ▲ UC Davis: Shields Library, Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616
- ▲ Dixon: Dixon Public Library, 230 N. First Street, Dixon, CA 95620
- ▲ Woodland: Woodland Public Library, 250 First Street, Woodland, CA 95695
- ▲ West Sacramento: Arthur F. Turner Branch Library, 1212 Merkley Avenue, West Sacramento, CA 95691
- ▲ Winters: Winters Community Library, 708 Railroad Avenue, Winters, CA 95694

The Draft EIR and cited reference materials were also made available at the Office of Campus Planning and Environmental Stewardship, Suite 436 in Mrak Hall, north end of Mrak Hall Drive at UC Davis.

As required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(b), at least 10 days before consideration of the Final EIR for certification, UC Davis provided a written response (hard or electronic copy) to each public agency that submitted written comments on the Draft EIR.

1.2 CONSIDERATIONS SINCE ISSUANCE OF THE DRAFT EIR

Since issuance of the Draft EIR, certain modifications have been made to the project planning/design and to the characterization of certain projects outside UC Davis. Due to statements made and analysis conducted for the Draft EIR, the modifications have been evaluated to determine whether additional analysis as part of this EIR is required.

1.2.1 West Village Expansion Component

Since issuance of the Draft EIR on April 13, 2018, and because of the subsequent planning and design of the West Village Expansion component, the proposed on-site parking has been amended to reflect tandem parking instead of the previously proposed single parking stalls. This amendment would provide additional parking at the West Village Expansion site for a total of approximately 1,288 parking spaces in surface parking lots with additional on-street parking. This modification represents an increase of approximately 500 spaces compared to what was expressed in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” of Volume 2 of the Draft EIR. The boundary of the West Village Expansion site has not changed since issuance of the Draft EIR, and the on-site parking ratio (approximately 0.42 space per bed with on-street parking) is less than for the representative local student apartments that were surveyed to determine the trip generation rate used in Section 3.16, “Transportation, Circulation, and Parking,” of Volume 2 of the Draft EIR.

As a result, the trip generation discussion in the Draft EIR, which included a reasonable but conservative analysis of future vehicle trips to and from the West Village Expansion site, does not require adjustment to reflect conditions that would occur if more students park near housing at West Village. In addition, potential impacts associated with construction and operation of the West Village Expansion component, including those related to changes in physical conditions at the West Village Expansion site and vehicle trip rates, volumes, and lengths, would not change beyond what is identified in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR. Further, the efficiencies realized on-site would reduce the need and urgency to construct the remote parking area that was evaluated in Volume 2 of the Draft EIR. It is anticipated that the remote parking area would remain a component of the 2018 LRDP, as evaluated in Volume 2; however, the timing of its construction would be adjusted, as determined by UC Davis, to best accommodate increases in campus enrollment or other needs. Because this change would not result in a change in the boundaries of the West Village Expansion site and

because amendments to the trip generation and distribution provided in Volumes 1 and 2 would not require adjustment, this consideration does not constitute a major change that could qualify as substantial new information and require additions or other changes to the analysis provided as part of the Draft EIR.

1.2.2 Nishi Gateway Project

On June 5, 2018, residents of the City of Davis approved, under Measure J/R (as adopted by the City Council), the Nishi Gateway Project, which was identified as a cumulative project in Chapter 4, “Cumulative Impacts,” and within Chapter 6, “Alternatives,” in Volume 1 of the Draft EIR. However, the Nishi Gateway Project is still subject to a pending legal challenge to its CEQA documentation, which could prevent or delay development of the site as a project by the City of Davis. As a result, the treatment of the Nishi Gateway Project within Chapters 4 and 6 in Volume 1 of the Draft EIR is still considered appropriate, and recent developments related to its approval by the City of Davis do not alter the conclusions of or necessitate revisions to the 2018 LRDP EIR.

1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THE RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Chapter 2 of this document consists of the written comments received on the Draft EIR and presents responses to environmental issues raised in the comments (as required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15132). The focus of the responses to comments is on the disposition of significant environmental issues that are raised in the comments, as required by Section 15088(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Each comment letter has been reproduced with individual comments bracketed and numbered according to the type of commenter (state agency, local/regional agency, organization, individual, commenter at public hearing). Responses to the comments follow each letter. For example, the response to the second comment of the second local agency letter would be indicated as Response to Comment L2-2. In some instances, clarifications of the text of the Draft EIR may be required. In those cases, the text of the Draft EIR is revised and the changes compiled in Chapter 4, “Corrections and Revisions to the Draft EIR.” The text deletions are shown with ~~strikeout~~ (strikeout), and additions are shown with double underline (double underline).

1.4 COMMENTS THAT REQUIRE RESPONSES

Section 15088(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines specifies that the focus of the responses to comments shall be on the disposition of significant environmental issues. Responses are not required on comments regarding the merits of the 2018 LRDP, project-level components, or on issues not related to potential physical environmental impacts. Comments on the merits of the 2018 LRDP or other comments that do not raise environmental issues are nevertheless included within the record for consideration as part of the 2018 LRDP. The responses address environmental issues and indicate where issues raised are not environmental or address the merits of the projects. In the latter instance, no further response is provided.

1.5 PROJECT DECISION PROCESS

This document (Volume 4) and the Draft EIR (Volumes 1 through 3), as amended through responses to comments, together constitute the Final EIR, which will be considered by The Regents prior to a decision on whether to approve the project. If The Regents decide to approve the project, The Regents, as required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15090, must first certify that the Final EIR was completed in compliance with CEQA's requirements, was reviewed and considered by The Regents and UC Davis, and reflects independent judgment and analysis. The Regents would then be required to adopt findings of fact on the disposition of each significant environmental impact, as required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. If significant and unavoidable impacts (those that cannot be mitigated to less than significant) would result from implementing the 2018 LRDP and The Regents chooses to approve the 2018 LRDP, The Regents would need to adopt a statement of overriding considerations, under Section 15093, explaining the overriding factors that The Regents deems allow the proposed plan to move forward. A mitigation monitoring and reporting program, which is required by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(d), has been included as part of Chapter 3 of this document and will be adopted by The Regents in conjunction with any project approval.