

City of Davis
Climate Action and Adaptation Plan
Initial Study/Proposed Negative Declaration

Prepared for
City of Davis



Prepared by:
AECOM



February 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
1 INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1 Overview	1-1
1.2 Purpose of the Initial Study	1-1
1.3 Summary of Findings	1-2
1.4 Approvals	1-2
1.5 Document Organization	1-2
2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2-1
2.1 Project Location	2-1
2.2 Project Overview	2-1
2.3 Project Description	2-3
Climate Action and Adaptation Plan	2-3
Greenhouse Gas Emissions Significance Thresholds	2-6
Efficiency-Based Thresholds	2-7
State GHG Reduction Efforts	2-8
Baseline Conditions: Greenhouse Gas Inventories	2-11
3 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	3-1
3.1 Aesthetics	3.1-1
Discussion	3.1-1
3.2 Agriculture & Forestry Resources	3.2-1
Discussion	3.2-2
3.3 Air Quality	3.3-1
Discussion	3.3-1
3.4 Biological Resources	3.4-1
Discussion	3.4-2
3.5 Cultural Resources	3.5-1
Discussion	3.5-1
3.6 Energy Resources	3.6-1
Discussion	3.6-1
3.7 Geology and Soils	3.7-1
Discussion	3.7-2
3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	3.8-1
Discussion	3.8-1
3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	3.9-1
Discussion	3.9-2
3.10 Hydrology and Water Quality	3.10-1
Discussion	3.10-2
3.11 Land Use and Planning	3.11-1

	Discussion.....	3.11-1
3.12	Mineral Resources	3.12-1
	Discussion.....	3.12-1
3.13	Noise and Vibration.....	3.13-1
	Discussion.....	3.13-1
3.14	Population and Housing	3.14-1
	Discussion.....	3.14-1
3.15	Public Services.....	3.15-1
	Discussion.....	3.15-1
3.16	Recreation.....	3.16-1
	Discussion.....	3.16-1
3.17	Transportation	3.17-1
	Discussion.....	3.17-1
3.18	Tribal Cultural Resources.....	3.18-1
	Discussion.....	3.18-2
3.19	Utilities and Service Systems	3.19-1
	Discussion.....	3.19-2
3.20	Wildfire	3.20-1
	Discussion.....	3.20-1
3.21	Mandatory Findings of Significance	3.21-1
	Discussion.....	3.21-2
4	REFERENCES.....	4-1

Exhibit

Exhibit 2-1	Project Location.....	2-2
-------------	-----------------------	-----

Table

Table 2.3-1	2016 Activity Data and Emissions	2-12
-------------	--	------

ACRONYMS AND OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Assembly Bill
ARB	Air Resources Board
ATCM	Airborne Toxic Control Measures
CAA	Clean Air Act (federal)
CAAP	Climate Action and Adaptation Plan
CAAQS	California ambient air quality standards
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CalFIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBC	California Building Code
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CH ₄	methane
City	City of Davis
CO	carbon monoxide
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
CO ₂ e	carbon dioxide equivalence
Davis	City of Davis
DDSP	Downtown Davis Specific Plan and Form-based Code
DOC	California Department of Conservation
DPM	diesel engine particulate matter
DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EO	Executive Order
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
EV	electric vehicle
FMMP	Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
GHG	greenhouse gas
GWP	Global warming potential

Handbook	ARB's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
hp	horsepower
I-80	Interstate 80
IS/ND	Initial Study/Proposed Negative Declaration
lb/day	pounds per day
LCFS	Low Carbon Fuel Standard
LED	light-emitting diode
LEV	Low-Emissions Vehicle
mph	miles per hour
MT	metric tons
N ₂ O	nitrous oxide
NAAQS	national ambient air quality standards
NCCP	Natural Community Conservation Plan
ND	Negative Declaration
NO _x	nitrogen oxide
PM	particulate matter
PM ₁₀	PM equal to or less than 10 micrometers in diameter
PM _{2.5}	PM equal to or less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter
PV	photovoltaic
ROG	reactive organic gas
RPS	Renewables Portfolio Standard
SACOG	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
SB	Senate Bill
SB 32	Senate Bill 32, California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SFNA	Sacramento Federal Nonattainment Area
SJUSD	San Juan Unified School District
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SVAB	Sacramento Valley Air Basin
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

The City of Davis (“Davis”) has prepared this Initial Study/Proposed Negative Declaration (IS/ND) in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines to address the environmental consequences of the Draft 2020-2040 Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP) for Davis, California.

The City of Davis has prepared the CAAP (also referred to as the proposed project) to address Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions consistent with the target reductions of Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the AB 32 Scoping Plan, Senate Bill (SB) 32, and Executive Order (“EO”) B-30-15, which set forth State policy related to GHG emissions reduction. The CAAP would streamline future environmental review of projects in the City by utilizing CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5, Tiering and Streamlining the Analysis of Greenhouse Gas Emissions, which, in part, states:

Lead agencies may analyze and mitigate the significant effects of greenhouse gas emissions at a programmatic level, such as in...a separate plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Later project-specific environmental documents may tier from and/or incorporate by reference that existing programmatic review. CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5(a).

The CAAP provides goals and associated measures, also referred to as reduction measures, in the sectors of energy use, transportation, land use, water, solid waste, and off-road equipment.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE INITIAL STUDY

This document is an IS/ND prepared in accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, Section 15000 et seq. of the California Code of Regulations). The purpose of this IS/ND is to (1) determine whether project implementation would result in potentially significant or significant effects on the environment; and (2) incorporate mitigation measures, as necessary, to eliminate the project’s potentially significant or significant project effects or reduce them to a less-than-significant level.

If there is substantial evidence (such as the findings of an IS) that a project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the physical environment, the lead agency must prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064[a]). If the IS concludes that impacts would be less than significant or that mitigation measures would clearly reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level, a negative declaration (ND) or mitigated negative declaration (MND) can be prepared.

An ND or MND is a written statement prepared by the lead agency describing why the proposed project would not have a significant impact on the environment and, therefore, would not require preparing an environmental impact report (CEQA Guidelines Section 15371). According to Section 15070 of the CEQA Guidelines, an ND or MND should be prepared when either:

- ▶ the initial study shows that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the lead agency, that the project may have a significant impact on the environment; or
- ▶ the initial study identifies potentially significant impacts, but:
 - revisions made to the project plans or proposal before the proposed MND is released for public review would avoid the impacts or mitigate the impacts to a point where clearly no significant impacts would occur; and
 - there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the proposed project as revised may have a significant impact on the environment.

The City has analyzed the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, determined that the proposed project's impacts would be less than significant, and therefore has prepared this IS/ND.

1.3 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Chapter 3 of this document contains the analysis and discussion of potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. The analysis in this initial study concludes that the proposed project would have no significant impacts or less than significant impacts. As such, further environmental review is not required by CEQA.

1.4 APPROVALS

Approval of the proposed project requires discretionary action by the City, which includes adopting the IS/ND. The project requires the City Council approval of the CAAP and adoption of the ND. Although individual projects may be implemented under the CAAP, each project would be subject to a separate environmental review under CEQA, as required and applicable.

1.5 DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

This Initial Study is organized into four chapters:

- ▶ **Chapter 1, "Introduction,"** provides summary information about the proposed project and describes the purpose and content of the Initial Study, the project background, and the necessary permits and approvals.

- ▶ **Chapter 2, “Project Description,”** provides the project location, project objectives, and a detailed project description.
- ▶ **Chapter 3, “Environmental Checklist,”** contains the completed initial study checklist. The checklist contains an assessment and discussion of impacts associated with each particular environmental issue.
- ▶ **Chapter 4, “References,”** identifies the information sources used in preparing this Initial Study.

This page intentionally left blank

2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The City of Davis (City) is in the Sacramento Valley, 50 miles northeast of San Francisco and 15 miles west of Sacramento. The City is located in the southeastern corner of Yolo County, along Interstate 80 (I-80) (Exhibit 2-1). The City's planning area is much larger than the City limits and the existing developed area and comprises approximately 160 square miles and 14 geographic subareas. The developed portion of the City consists of single-family and multi-family residential, retail and industrial uses, schools, recreation, and open spaces. The planning area is bounded on the north by County Road 27 and the City of Woodland planning area, by the eastern edge of the Yolo Bypass, on the south by Tremont Road and the Pedrick Road/I-80 interchange in Solano County, and on the west by an extension of County Road 93. A portion of the planning area is located in eastern Solano County.

2.2 PROJECT OVERVIEW

The proposed project includes the adoption and implementation of the City's Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP) and the establishment of a greenhouse gas (GHG) emission significance thresholds for use in California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review of future discretionary projects proposed for City approval. This environmental checklist provides analysis of the potential environmental effects associated with implementation of the proposed CAAP and provides evidence supporting the adoption and use of the City's proposed GHG emissions significance thresholds.

The proposed CAAP includes emission reduction measures and implementation programs designed to achieve the City's reduction target and goal. The proposed CAAP addresses emissions targets through reduced dependency on fossil fuels and nonrenewable energy sources and increased efficient use of resources consumed. It also provides a way to connect climate change mitigation (i.e., GHG emissions reduction) to climate adaptation, community resilience, and broader community goals. The proposed CAAP contains community-wide and government operations GHG emission inventories to establish a baseline. The proposed CAAP also summarizes a forecast of probable future emissions levels if no action to reduce emissions is taken. The CAAP and the proposed actions will continue to be regularly reviewed through community engagement, progress monitoring, and exploration of emerging opportunities. CAAP updates are routinely planned every five years and greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories will be conducted every two years.

Upon adoption of the proposed CAAP, the City will implement its reduction measures, monitor progress towards achievement of the reduction target and goal, and then evaluate the effectiveness of the results to make adjustments to improve the performance of proposed CAAP measures.




Exhibit 2-1. Project Location

2.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

CLIMATE ACTION AND ADAPTATION PLAN

The proposed CAAP identifies measures to achieve the City Council's goal of creating a roadmap of carbon reduction strategies to help the City reach carbon neutrality by 2040. The proposed CAAP creates and prioritizes climate action and carbon reduction strategies toward this goal of carbon neutrality (mitigation actions), as well as addresses measures to respond to physical and social vulnerabilities identified in the Vulnerability Assessment (adaptation actions). The recommendations and commitments outlined in the proposed CAAP are consistent with the City's current General Plan and the Downtown Davis Specific Plan and bring the City into compliance with current State legislation (Section 2.3.1, State GHG Reduction Efforts).

The proposed CAAP includes qualitative and quantifiable steps to combat climate change and decrease greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that align with the City's priorities, aims to cut GHG emissions by 40 percent below 2016 levels by 2030 and put the City on a path to achieve carbon neutrality by 2040. The aspirational target is 5.2 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalents (MT CO₂e/capita/year) (or 53 percent below 2016 levels) and represents a 57-percent emissions intensity reduction from 2016 levels of 12.0 MT CO₂e/capita. The minimum 2030 target is 340,200 MT CO₂e/capita/year and an emissions intensity of 6.6 MT CO₂e/capita/year.

The projected GHG reduction from proposed CAAP actions falls short of the 2030 GHG target (i.e., 40 percent below 2016 levels) and the aspirational goal to achieve an emissions intensity level of 5.2 MT CO₂e/capita/year. The City's 2040 carbon neutrality goal is five years ahead of the State's most recent target set in Assembly Bill 1279, which calls for statewide carbon neutrality by 2045. The proposed CAAP identifies goals and priority actions with emissions reduction and includes recommended action steps, co-benefits, cost, and funding sources. The following includes the goals and priority actions in the proposed CAAP:

- ▶ Transition to high efficiency, zero carbon homes and buildings
- ▶ Expand local renewable energy development and storage
- ▶ Adopt zero-emissions vehicles and equipment to reduce fossil fuel use
- ▶ Increase opportunities for active mobility in the community
- ▶ Strengthen transit service and reduce single-occupant vehicle use
- ▶ Expand opportunities for local housing development to balance local employment opportunities

- ▶ Conserve water in our buildings and landscapes
- ▶ Reduce waste generation and increase diversion away from landfills
- ▶ Create a cooler city with more urban forest and green space for people and habitat
- ▶ Protect public health, safety, and infrastructure against damage and disruption from flooding
- ▶ Prepare and respond to climate hazards to ensure that the City is equipped to address current and future challenges
- ▶ Demonstrate climate leadership through innovation, education, and investment

The CAAP proposes that the City address electrification of all building systems; provide community education and outreach to support building energy-efficiency upgrades and electric (or other non-fossil fuel) equipment replacement when permits are required for residential and commercial properties; develop financing/incentive options for rental property owners to make energy efficiency and cooling/ventilation upgrades; and continue to update the City’s residential and non-residential reach codes to require all-electric new construction and renovations and increase electric vehicle charging infrastructure requirements; adopt a requirement that all new municipal building construction must be all-electric.

The CAAP proposes that the City invest in community solar energy and provide solar battery storage; switch from fossil gas to electricity, renewable hydrogen, or other non-fossil renewables in all existing City facilities; incentivize the creation of community microgrids, community battery “co-ops,” and the networking of local energy sources to support resiliency hubs; update and implement the Davis Electric Vehicle Charging Plan (2017) to determine public and private charging infrastructure needs, time frame, and implementation approach to enable all vehicles to go electric; develop an aggressive plan to transition the municipal vehicle fleet to alternative fuels (e.g., electric, battery electric vehicle, hydrogen); develop a shared electric micromobility program and charging plan; and develop financing/incentives for purchasing, using, and maintaining electric micromobility vehicles for personal use (such as bicycles, scooters, trailers).

The CAAP proposes that the City subsidize public transit so it is free for all to use and promote expansion of public transit routes and increased operation frequency within Davis to support day-to-day travel needs; implement roadway infrastructure improvements in existing right-of-way, such as “road diets,” narrower pedestrian crossing distances, green stormwater infrastructure; coordinate with regional transit agencies and cities to promote cohesive transit interconnections, including express buses to Woodland, West Sacramento, and Sacramento; revisit most recent parking pricing study; develop a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program to encourage and/or require “all people, all trips” to implement TDM strategies,

such as remote work opportunities, community education and outreach, micromobility, vanpool, rideshare, subsidized transit, employee parking cash-out; and establish a low-emissions vehicle program for Downtown Davis that disincentivizes travel by internal combustion engine vehicles.

The CAAP proposes that the City develop incentive options to increase housing construction in the City, including high-density, mixed-use (especially office space and food service), transit-oriented, and affordable options.

The CAAP proposes that the City promote climate-ready private landscapes, such as installing drought tolerant, native, climate-ready plants and/or xeriscaping; programs that support turf removal; installing rainwater capture and harvesting equipment; and the use of green stormwater measures to enhance natural water infiltration; develop an ordinance to require the use of cool surfaces, reflective materials, and coatings to reduce the heat island effect; expand urban forest in parks, greenbelts, and open space with climate-ready species that provide shade, and develop a tree-replacement plan for street trees for all neighborhoods; develop policies that require air filtration and air conditioning in new and existing residential and commercial properties, with a priority on residential rental properties; develop policies to increase the use of green stormwater infrastructure and enhance natural water infiltration in public infrastructure; relocate/elevate critical infrastructure out of projected flood areas; aggressively implement important existing climate-related efforts, such as stormwater management policies, urban water management programs and plans, the 2023 update to the Urban Forestry Management Plan (UFMP), water conservation programs, and solid waste reduction programs; and develop policies to expand existing public services and resources, such as cooling and weather relief centers during extreme weather events.

The CAAP proposes that the City research carbon sequestration and removal opportunities the City can pursue to balance remaining emissions by 2040, and use findings and recommendations to advance actions; develop carbon farm plans for City-owned agricultural land and seek grant funding to implement recommended strategies for maximum carbon sequestration; and establish a carbon mitigation fund to collect voluntary and/or mandatory payments to mitigate local emissions activities.

The Final Draft 2020-2040 Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP) was presented to City Council on December 6, 2022 to get direction for making final revisions. This IS/ND was developed based on the Final Draft CAAP, dated December 6, 2022, along with changes being incorporated into to the FINAL CAAP based on City Council direction. This included direction for language related to building electrification that would have the City focus for three years on a robust voluntary and public education based approach and a commitment to whether or not the voluntary approach and public education focused approach is meeting the City's targets, with appropriate changes. Additional direction focused on incorporating Valley Clean Energy updated assumptions of GHG scoring of energy procurement inventory, including additional

costs and roll out information regarding transportation demand management plans, and including a study to assess existing conditions of Davis property and readiness for electrification.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS

In addition to the CAAP, this Initial Study examines the City’s proposed GHG emissions thresholds, which would be used by the City to review public and private projects that are subject to CEQA review. These significance thresholds would determine whether proposed projects have a cumulatively considerable or less than cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact of greenhouse gas emissions. Two thresholds are proposed by the City: a bright-line threshold and an efficiency-based threshold. The adoption thresholds with two methodologies allows for different types of projects to be evaluated more appropriately than a one-size-fits-all approach would provide.

A bright-line threshold is a numeric, total mass (metric tons) of GHG emissions per year from a given project. If project-generated emissions are estimated to be less than the City’s bright-line threshold, impacts would be presumed to be less than cumulatively considerable. In such cases, no additional analysis or implementation of mitigation would be required. If a project’s GHG total amortized annual construction emissions and operational emissions would exceed the bright-line threshold, all feasible mitigation would be required to reduce emissions to a level below the threshold, or GHG offsets/credits purchased if feasible mitigation could not reduce emissions to the level required. Annual amortized emissions are calculated by dividing total construction-related emissions by the anticipated project life in years. If there are existing emitting uses on a project site, those emissions would be estimated and removed from the total emissions estimate. The net change in emissions would be compared to the threshold. The City’s bright-line threshold is set by year, as shown below, and project emissions are calculated for the opening year.

The bright-line threshold was developed by using a level of 1,100 MT CO_{2e} per year in the year 2020, and then reducing this level of emissions by 85 percent between 2020 and 2045, consistent with the target included as a part of AB 1279. Regarding this mass emissions level – a 1,100 MT threshold was estimated to capture 98 percent of total GHG emissions of projects reviewed by a CEQA document in the Sacramento region (SMAQMD 2014, 2020). AB 1279 requires 1990 statewide emissions to be reduced by 85 percent by 2045. Therefore, to ensure consistency with AB 1279 as the most recent representation of the State’s legislative framework for GHG emissions reduction, the City’s proposed bright-line threshold decreases for each year between 2020 and 2045 at the same rate – 85 percent between 2020 and 2045.

- ▶ 2023: 988 MT CO_{2e}/year
- ▶ 2024: 950 MT CO_{2e}/year
- ▶ 2025: 913 MT CO_{2e}/year

- ▶ 2026: 876 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2027: 838 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2028: 801 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2029: 763 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2030: 726 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2031: 689 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2032: 651 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2033: 614 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2034: 576 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2035: 539 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2036: 502 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2037: 464 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2038: 427 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2039: 389 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2040: 352 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2041: 315 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2042: 277 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2043: 240 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2044: 202 MT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2045: 165 MT CO₂e/year

EFFICIENCY-BASED THRESHOLDS

An efficiency-based threshold is a measure of a project’s GHG emissions intensity, or emissions per service population or per capita. Under this approach, emissions are evaluated with reference to the population that would be served by a particular project. The efficiency metric threshold represents the intensity of a project’s emissions normalized against its population or “service population;” a service population is typically defined as the sum of residents plus employees. Since an efficiency threshold is built using only those emissions and service population from sectors relevant to land use development projects, it is appropriate for application to land use development projects. As with the bright-line threshold, if a project’s GHG emissions would exceed the efficiency-based threshold, all feasible mitigation would be required to reduce emissions to a level below the threshold, or GHG offsets/credits purchased if feasible mitigation could not reduce emissions to the level required. As with the bright-line thresholds, total emissions are evaluated, including both amortized annual construction emissions and operational emissions. The net change in emissions would be compared to the threshold. The City’s efficiency-based threshold is 2.88 MT CO₂e/service population/year. This emissions rate, 2.88 MT CO₂e/service population/year, is a “budget” for emissions per unit of activity (service population) – ensuring that emissions do not exceed this rate demonstrates consistency with the State’s legislative framework for emissions reduction. To develop the efficiency target, the statewide mass emissions target for 2030 required under SB 32 is divided

by the forecast population and employment statewide for 2030. To tailor this threshold for use by the City, the statewide mass emissions target, population, and employment were adjusted to focus on the emissions sources that occur within Davis. If a proposed project would achieve this threshold, it would demonstrate a GHG emissions rate that would be consistent with the State legislative framework for GHG emissions reductions, including the SB 32 reduction target for 2030, and substantial progress toward the State's long-term goal of carbon neutrality by 2045.

STATE GHG REDUCTION EFFORTS

California efforts began with EO S-3-05 in 2005. EO S-3-05 recognizes California's vulnerability to a reduced snowpack, exacerbation of air quality problems, and potential sea-level rise due to a changing climate. To address these concerns, the governor established targets to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 2000 levels by 2010, 1990 levels by 2020, and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. In 2006, California became the first state in the country to adopt a statewide GHG reduction target through AB 32. This law codifies the EO S-3-05 requirement to reduce statewide emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Then, in early 2015, Governor Brown signed EO B-30-15 to establish an interim target between the 2020 and 2050 targets, calling for reductions of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. Senate Bill 32, California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (SB 32), was signed by the Governor on September 8, 2016. AB 1279, approved by Governor Newsom on September 16, 2022 establishes the policy of the state to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions as soon as possible but no later than 2045 and to ensure that by 2045, statewide anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions are reduced by at least 85 percent compared to 1990 levels.

AB 32 resulted in the 2008 adoption by the California Air Resources Board (ARB) of a Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan), outlining the State's plan to achieve the AB 32 GHG target through emission reductions that consist of direct regulations, alternative compliance mechanisms, different types of incentives, voluntary actions, market-based mechanisms, and funding. The Scoping Plan addresses similar topic areas to this proposed CAAP, including transportation, building energy efficiency, water conservation, waste reduction, and green infrastructure. AB 32 engendered several companion laws that can assist the City in reducing community-wide GHG emissions. These legislative actions and regulations are referred to as statewide actions throughout the City's proposed CAAP and represent a significant source of estimated GHG reductions.

The proposed CAAP estimates the GHG emission reductions from:

- ▶ Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS),
- ▶ AB 1109 – Lighting Efficiency,
- ▶ California 2013 Building Energy Efficiency Standards,
- ▶ AB 1493 – Clean Car Standards,

- ▶ EO-S-1-07 – Low Carbon Fuel Standard
- ▶ Low-Emission Vehicle III (Advanced Clean Cars Program), and
- ▶ Heavy-Duty Vehicle Aerodynamic Efficiency Regulations.

The adoption of SB 32 provides ARB with a statutory basis for updating the Scoping Plan to address the State's 2030 GHG reduction target, which will likely include expansion of existing policies and programs and/or development of new GHG-reducing strategies. As the regulatory framework surrounding the State's GHG targets grows, it may be possible to evaluate a broader range of statewide reductions at the local community level. The following section presents an overview of these statewide actions included in the proposed CAAP.

Renewables Portfolio Standard

SB 1078, SB 107, EO-S-14-08, and SB X1-2 have established RPS requirements for California utilities. RPS-eligible energy sources include wind, solar, geothermal, biomass, and small-scale hydro. SB 1078 requires investor-owned utilities to provide at least 20 percent of their electricity from renewable resources by 2020.

- ▶ SB 107 accelerates the SB 1078 timeframe to take effect in 2010.
- ▶ EO-S-14-08 increases the RPS further to 33 percent by 2020.
- ▶ SB X1-2 codifies the 33 percent RPS requirement established by EO-S-14-08.
- ▶ SB 350 increased the RPS to 50 percent by 2030.

AB 1109 – Lighting Efficiency

AB 1109 was signed into law in 2007. The California Lighting Efficiency and Toxics Reduction Act requires the California Energy Commission to adopt energy efficiency standards for all general purpose lights, reducing lighting energy usage in indoor residences and State facilities by no less than 50 percent by 2018, as well as require a 25 percent reduction in commercial facilities by that same date. To achieve these efficiency levels, the California Energy Commission (CEC) applied its existing appliance efficiency standards to include lighting products, as well as required minimum lumen/watt standards for different categories of lighting products. In addition, the bill prohibits the manufacturing for sale or the sale of certain general purpose lights that contain hazardous substances.

Building Energy Efficiency Standards

California's Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations Title 24) dictates how new buildings and major remodels are constructed in California. The Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6) are a subset of the State building code, which detail energy efficiency standards for residential and non-residential development. The standards are updated on an approximately three-year cycle. The current 2022 Building Energy Efficiency Standards went into effect on January 1, 2023.

The California Green Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations Title 24, Part 11) includes additional requirements for new construction and renovation projects that may also result in emissions reductions. The City's proposed CAAP does not include these reductions as a separate measure. However, the impact of these requirements may be accounted for in other CAAP statewide or local reduction measures (e.g., construction and demolition waste diversion requirements).

Net Zero Energy New Buildings

In the 2007 Integrated Energy Policy Report, the CEC adopted a goal to achieve net zero energy buildings in new residential construction by 2020 and non-residential construction by 2030. A net zero energy building consumes only as much energy annually as can be generated with an on-site renewable energy system (e.g., solar, wind, geothermal). While the pathway to realize this goal has not yet been defined, this goal will play a role in the future ability to achieve the State's long-term reduction target. Future reduction estimates associated with this goal may be quantifiable once an implementation pathway has been defined.

AB 1493 – Clean Car Standards

AB 1493, California's mobile-source GHG emissions regulations for passenger vehicles, or California Clean Car Standards, was signed into law in 2002. AB 1493 requires ARB to develop and adopt regulations that reduce GHG emissions from passenger vehicles, light-duty trucks, and other non-commercial vehicles for personal transportation. In 2004, ARB approved amendments to the California Code of Regulations, adding GHG emissions standards to California's existing standards for motor vehicle emissions.

EO-S-1-07 – Low Carbon Fuel Standard

EO-S-01-07 reduces the carbon intensity of California's transportation fuels by at least 10 percent by 2020. The Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) is a performance standard with flexible compliance mechanisms that provide incentives for developing a diverse set of clean, low-carbon transportation fuel options to reduce GHG emissions.

Low-Emission Vehicle III

In 2012, ARB adopted the Low-Emissions Vehicle (LEV) III amendments to California's LEV regulations. As part of the Advanced Clean Cars Program, these amendments include more stringent emission standards for criteria pollutants and GHG emissions for new passenger vehicles. Referred to as LEV III, the regulation combines new GHG emissions with control of smog-causing pollutants standards. This new approach also includes efforts under the Zero-Emission Vehicle Program to support the increased use of plug-in hybrids and zero-emission vehicles (ZEV). The LEV III exhaust emission standards will be phased in for new vehicle

models from 2017 through 2025 for passenger cars, light-duty trucks, and medium-duty passenger vehicles.

Heavy-Duty Vehicle Aerodynamic Efficiency

This regulation requires existing trucks/trailers to be retrofitted with the best available technology and/or ARB-approved technology to increase vehicle aerodynamics and fuel efficiency, resulting in GHG reductions. This measure was identified as a Discrete Early Action in the Scoping Plan, which means it needed to be enforceable beginning in 2010. Technologies that reduce GHG emissions and improve the fuel efficiency of trucks may include devices that reduce aerodynamic drag and rolling resistance. These requirements apply to both California-registered and out-of-state registered trucks traveling to California.

BASELINE CONDITIONS: GREENHOUSE GAS INVENTORIES

Baseline Inventory

The proposed CAAP included data from the 2016 GHG emissions inventory and was organized into categories based on the following source of emissions:

1. On-road Transportation: Emissions associated with all on-road vehicles, including passenger cars, light-, medium-, and heavy-duty trucks, buses, motorcycles, and mobile homes.
2. Electricity: Emissions from metered electricity consumption used in buildings and facilities are generated by powerplants that produce electricity.
3. Natural Gas: Emissions from metered natural gas consumption.
4. Off-Road Equipment: Emissions from using off-road vehicles and equipment such as construction, agricultural, and lawn and garden equipment.
5. Solid Waste: Emissions from waste disposal in landfills; these emissions result from the decomposition of organic material sent to landfills but do not include waste hauling emissions reflected in the on-road transportation sector.
6. Water Supply: Emissions associated with energy used for water treatment, transport, and distribution.
7. Wastewater: Process and fugitive emissions from domestic sewage treatment and effluent discharge.

Table 2.3-1 below shows the total MT CO_{2e} by emissions sector from the 2016 GHG inventory, in which the City generated a total of 567,000 MTCO_{2e}. A majority of these emissions were generated from on-road transportation (74 percent). The remaining emissions came from natural gas and electricity use (15 percent), off-road equipment (4 percent), wastewater treatment (3 percent), solid waste disposal (3 percent), and water supply (<1 percent).

Table 2.3-1. 2016 Activity Data and Emissions

Emissions Sector	Emissions (MT CO₂e)	Community-wide Total
Residential Electricity	18,005	3%
Residential Natural Gas	42,003	7%
Commercial Electricity	11,891	2%
Commercial Natural Gas	14,505	3%
On-Road Transportation	421,357	74%
Off-Road Equipment	24,825	4%
Solid Waste	14,609	3%
Water Supply	518	<1%
Wastewater	19,286	3%
Total	567,000	100%

GHG Forecasts

The City's CAAP includes 2030 and 2040 "business-as-usual" forecasts of GHG reduction target years that will enable the City to estimate the amount of emissions reductions needed to meet its goal. Forecasts predict a 15-percent reduction in emissions by 2030 and a 20-percent reduction by 2040 when compared to 2016 levels. The estimated reductions occur in the on-road transportation sector. Although travel by car is anticipated to increase between 2016 and 2040, the State's vehicle fuel efficiency rules are expected to result in a gradual decline in transportation emissions.

GHG Reduction and Aspirational Targets

The 2030 and 2040 GHG targets were all analyzed in the proposed CAAP. The City has set a minimum and aspirational 2030 GHG target. The minimum 2030 GHG target requires the City to cut its GHG emissions by at least 40 percent from its 2016 levels. The State's GHG objective, put forth in SB 32, to achieve GHG reductions of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030, is mirrored by this aim. To meet this goal, the City must cut GHG emissions by a minimum of 143,692 MT CO₂e/year below the anticipated levels for 2030.

The City's 2030 aspirational GHG target is 5.2 MT CO₂e/capita/year. This represents a 57-percent emissions intensity reduction from 2016 levels of 12.0 MT CO₂e/capita. This is also equal to an absolute GHG target of 266,883 MT CO₂e/year in 2030 based on the population forecasts used in the GHG emissions forecasts and would require reductions of 217,008 MT CO₂e/year.

The 2030 GHG reductions would fall short of the City's 2030 GHG target (i.e., 40 percent below 2016 levels) and the aspirational goal to achieve an emissions intensity level of 5.2 MT CO₂e/capita/year.

This page intentionally left blank

3 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

PROJECT INFORMATION	
1. Project Title:	City of Davis 2020-2040 CAAP
2. Lead Agency Name and Address:	City of Davis, 23 Russell Boulevard Davis, CA 95616
3. Contact Person:	Kerry Loux, CAAP Project Manager, City of Davis City of Davis 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616
4. Project Location:	Davis, CA
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:	City of Davis
6. General Plan Designation:	Existing land use designations include Residential-Low Density, Residential-Medium Density, Residential-High Density, Neighborhood Retail, Community Retail, General Commercial, Office, Business Park, University Related Research Park, Industrial, University of California Davis, Public/Semi-Public, Parks/Recreation, Neighborhood Greenbelt, Urban Agriculture Transition Area, Agriculture, Urban Reserve, Natural Habitat Area and Open Space for Public Safety.
7. Zoning:	Existing zoning districts include Agricultural (A), Residential One-Family (R-1) District, Residential One- and Two-Family (R-2), Residential One- and Two-Family Conservation (R2-CD), Core Area Infill (C-I), Residential Restricted (R-R), Residential One- And Two-Family and Mobile Home (R-2-MH), Residential Garden Apartment (R-3), Residential High Density Apartment (R-HD), Residential Transitional (R-T), Interim Residential Conversion (RC), Commercial Neighborhood (C-N) Combining, Core Area Design (C-D) Combining, Downtown and Traditional Neighborhood Overlay, Central Commercial (C-C), Mixed Use (M-U), Auto Center (A-C), Commercial Service (C-S), Commercial Mixed Use (CMU), Community Retail (C-R), Industrial Administration ad Research (I-R), Industrial (I), Public-Semi Public (P-SP), Interim Study (S), and Planned Development (P-D).

PROJECT INFORMATION

8. Description of Project:

The proposed project is the adoption of the CAAP, a document that provides measures intended to reduce GHG emissions within the City. The CAAP supports recent City Council actions to assess greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction progress since the 2010 CAAP adoption, identify physical and social vulnerabilities, establish and prioritize climate action and carbon reduction policies toward carbon neutrality, and bring the City into compliance with current state legislation. The City commits to taking significant action to move toward net municipal and community carbon neutrality in the short term with maximum efforts to implement carbon reduction actions by 2030; and accelerate the existing 2050 Davis carbon neutrality goal to a 2040 target.

The CAAP identifies measures with quantifiable emissions reduction and includes recommended action steps, co-benefits, cost, and funding sources. The CAAP was formed with extensive community outreach and public participation; three community workshops were held on April 2021, June 2021, and July 2021. Participants learned about the CAAP, and the process and provided input and ideas to shape climate actions. Feedback from these sessions was incorporated, resulting in the measures included in the CAAP.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The Sacramento and American Rivers lie to the east, along with historic Gold Country, Lake Tahoe, and the Sierra Nevada Mountain range. The San Francisco Bay Area, the coastal redwood forest, and the Pacific Ocean are to the west. The Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region lies to the south. The City's land slopes at generally less than one percent. Elevations range from 60 feet in western parts of the city to 25 feet in some eastern parts. The City limits comprise approximately 10 square miles.

10: Other public agencies whose approval is required:

The City of Davis is the lead agency responsible for approving the proposed CAAP and its measures. No other public agency approvals are needed.

PROJECT INFORMATION

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier **EIR** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier **EIR** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Title

City of Davis

Agency

3.1 AESTHETICS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. Aesthetics. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No Impact. As described in the City General Plan EIR, there are no established scenic vistas and no designated State scenic highways within the City. Therefore, no impact would occur on a scenic vista.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. There are no state- or locally-designated scenic highways in the City. State Route 160 is the closest state-designated scenic highway, approximately 17 miles southeast (California Department of Transportation 2018). The CAAP does not include physical changes to scenic resources or historic buildings, but rather proposes actions that would, for example, promote electrification of buildings, expand electric vehicle charging, encourage public transit use, enhance pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and require the use of “cool surfaces” in new construction through a new ordinance to reduce the urban heat island effect. The CAAP does not facilitate any actions that would damage scenic resources such as trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway. Therefore, no impact would occur.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Physical changes to the visual environment that would occur with implementing the CAAP would be minimal. The CAAP commits the City to developing incentive option to increase housing construction in the City, including high-density, mixed-use (especially office space and food service), transit-oriented, and affordable options. If these incentives are among the factors encouraging development, depending on the location, size, scale, and type of the development, there could be impacts on the existing visual character. However, there is no indication currently of the location, scale, size, type, or character of development that could be partly encouraged by these incentives at this time, and the City’s approval of the CAAP does not increase, decrease, or change the location or design of development or change land use designations or zoning of proposed developments.

Chapter 3 of the City’s General Plan, Urban Design, Neighborhood Preservation and Community Forest Management, and Chapter 3.5 of the Downtown Davis Specific Plan includes policies and standards that reduce future potential impacts of development projects on the visual character. For example, projects that require discretionary review by the City would need to be consistent with the General Plan Policy UD 1.1, which promotes urban/community design that is human-scaled, comfortable, safe and conducive to pedestrian use and the standards that implement Policy UD 1.1. Projects that require discretionary review by the City would need to be consistent with General Plan Policy UD 2.1, which would require projects to preserve and protect scenic resources and elements in and around the City, including natural habitat, scenery, and resources reflective of place and history. Further, policy guidance related to community and physical character, built form, visual quality, and scenic

elements are included in the Downtown Davis Specific Plan Guiding Policies 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.1, 3.8, 3.13, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.5, 4.6, 5.5, 5.7 5.8, and 6.10.

Additionally, the GHG reduction measures result in the development of new rooftop photovoltaic (PV) solar systems for commercial or residential buildings and describe the development of an ordinance to require the use of reflective materials and coatings to reduce the heat island effect. These goals could have slight changes to the existing visual character but would be subject to Planning and Building Agency approval to determine appropriate sizing and placement before installation, as well as applicable City General Plan policies to ensure that they would not result in substantial changes to the visual character of the City. Therefore, the impacts on the existing visual character within the City would be less than significant.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The CAAP includes Action A.5 to partner with Valley Clean Energy to invest in solar energy generation and battery storage. However, solar PV systems are specifically designed to absorb sunlight, not reflect it. Thus, their placement and orientation on private or public structures would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. In addition, the CAAP proposes measures for building electrification, including installing light-emitting diode (LED) lighting for residential, commercial and public buildings. LED lighting reduces direct and reflected uplight, the primary causes of urban sky glow. No new lighting is anticipated to be installed as the goals proposed in the CAAP are replacing or retrofitting existing lighting sources.

Depending on the location and scale of development, mixed-use, transit-oriented and multifamily are encouraged in the CAAP. These development projects could have aesthetic impacts, such as new light and glare that may adversely affect day or nighttime views. However, the CAAP does not involve any development or other physical changes to the environment and does not directly change land use designations or zoning of proposed developments. Future development would be subject to environmental review at that time. The City's General Plan EIR requires mitigating potential impacts from new light sources in Policy UD-3.2 and requires adherence to Chapter 8 of the Davis Municipal Code-Article 8.171: Outdoor Lighting Control. The City General Plan does not include any pertinent policies related to new sources of glare. Therefore, impacts from light or glare would be less than significant. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

This page intentionally left blank

3.2 AGRICULTURE & FORESTRY RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
----------------------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources.

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997, as updated) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources.				
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

No Impact. Based on a review of the 2018 Important Farmland Map for Yolo County produced by the California Department of Conservation (DOC) under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), the City is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land (California Department of Conservation 2018). A small portion northwest of the City limits is designated as Farmland of Local Importance by the FMMP. While this portion is designated as Farmland of Local Importance by the California DOC, the CAAP does not propose any physical change that could affect agricultural land. Thus, the CAAP would not result in the conversion of the Farmland to non-agricultural use and no impact would occur.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. The CAAP does not include or direct zoning changes. Thus, the CAAP would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract and no impact would occur.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

No Impact. There is no land zoned for forest land, timberland, or timberland production in the City. Therefore the CAAP would not conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland production. Thus, there would be no impact.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. As mentioned in 3.2.1.c, the City does not have any land designated or zoned for forest use. No impact related to forest land conversion would occur.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. As mentioned in 3.2.1.a and 3.2.1.c, the City is urbanized and built up. There are no forest lands within the City, as defined by Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), nor are there any timber lands defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526. The CAAP does not propose any physical change that could affect any Important Farmland. Thus, there is no impact.

This page intentionally left blank

3.3 AIR QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. Air Quality.				
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.				
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

No Impact. The City of Davis is located in the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB), which consists of Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Sacramento, Shasta, Sutter, Tehama, Yolo, and Yuba counties, the western portion of Placer County, and the eastern portion of Solano County. The planning area of the CAAP is under the jurisdiction of Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD). As the local air quality management agency, YSAQMD is required to monitor air pollutant levels to ensure that the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) are met. Air quality plans describe air pollution control strategies to be implemented to bring an area that does not attain the NAAQS

or CAAQS into compliance with those standards, or to maintain existing compliance with those standards, pursuant to the requirements of the federal Clean Air Act (CAA) and California Clean Air Act (CCAA). The CAA and CCAA regulate six criteria air pollutants: ozone; carbon monoxide; nitrogen dioxide; sulfur dioxide; lead; and particulate matter (PM), which is subdivided into two classes based on particle size – PM equal to or less than 10 micrometers in diameter (PM₁₀) and PM equal to or less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter (PM_{2.5}).

YSAQMD has developed air quality plans pursuant to regulatory requirements under the CAA and CCAA for the attainment and maintenance of NAAQS or CAAQS. For ozone nonattainment, the Sacramento Regional 2008 NAAQS 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan was developed to describe and demonstrate how the Sacramento Federal Nonattainment Area (SFNA), which includes the YSAQMD, is meeting requirements under the federal CAA in demonstrating reasonable further progress and attainment of the NAAQS for ozone (YSAQMD 2017). For particulate matter, YSAQMD and the other air districts in the region developed the PM_{2.5} Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request (YSAQMD 2013) to address how the region attained and would continue to attain the 24-hour PM_{2.5} standard.

While the purpose and intended effect of the CAAP is to reduce GHG emissions generated in the City to help reduce the effects of climate change by encouraging alternatively fueled vehicles, reducing VMT, using renewable energy, electrifying residential and commercial buildings, reducing waste generation, and providing for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements, many of these measures and supporting actions would also reduce criteria air pollutant emissions. As such, the GHG reduction measures included in the CAAP are consistent with control measures included in YSAQMD's air quality plans. For example, the Sacramento Regional 2008 NAAQS 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan and PM_{2.5} Maintenance Plan include transportation control measures aimed at reducing motor vehicle emissions associated with vehicle trips, vehicle use, and vehicle miles traveled, which are consistent with CAAP measures of encouraging alternatively fueled vehicles, implementing transportation demand management strategies, increasing transit use, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Similarly, the CAAP measures also includes strategies for building electrification, and switching from fossil gas to electricity, renewable hydrogen, or other non-fossil renewables in all existing City facilities, which are consistent with stationary source control measures included in the Sacramento Regional 2008 NAAQS 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan and PM_{2.5} Maintenance Plan. Therefore, implementation of the CAAP would not conflict with the strategies and goals of the air quality plans.

GHG reduction measures could result in the construction of small-scale construction projects, such as electric vehicle charging stations, small-scale ground-mounted or rooftop PV solar systems on residential, commercial, and school buildings; retrofits to existing buildings would

not involve large amounts of labor or extensive use of construction equipment. Construction activities associated with implementation of any GHG reduction measures would be required to comply with YSAQMD rules and regulations established, in part, to ensure implementation of, and consistency with strategies and actions of the applicable air quality plans, including but not limited to Rule 2.3 (Ringlemann Chart), Rule 2.5 (Nuisance), Rule 2.11 (Particulate Matter Concentration), and Rule 2.14 (Architectural Coatings). The CAAP would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plans and no impact would occur.

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As a policy document, the CAAP would not result in impacts related to criteria pollutants. However, implementation of GHG reduction measures and supporting actions could result in the construction of small-scale construction projects, such as electric vehicle charging stations, small-scale ground-mounted or rooftop PV solar systems on residential, commercial, and school buildings, and retrofits to existing buildings, which would not involve extensive construction activity. Some ground disturbance, worker trips, and construction equipment may be required during installation of these facilities and features, resulting in short-term emissions of criteria air pollutants. However, construction activities would be required to comply with State and YSAQMD rules and regulations, which would minimize criteria air pollutant emissions during construction. Following construction, operation of the proposed GHG reduction measures may also include operational and maintenance activities, such as occasional inspection and cleaning of solar panels, which may generate minor criteria air pollutant emissions. However, many CAAP GHG reduction measures would have the secondary benefit of reducing criteria pollutant emissions. For example, GHG reduction measures that aim to increase building energy efficiency, promote carbon neutral energy, promote electric vehicles, reduce on-road fuel use, reduce vehicle miles traveled and promote travel via low- and zero-emissions modes would also reduce criteria air pollutants that would otherwise be generated as a result of fossil fuel combustion from conventional-fueled vehicles and natural gas consumption. Therefore, implementation of the CAAP would generally reduce criteria air pollutants in the region, providing a net benefit to air quality, and this impact would be less than significant.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As described previously, the proposed GHG reduction measures, when implemented, may require short-term construction activities (e.g., electric vehicle charging stations, small-scale ground-mounted or rooftop PV solar systems on residential, commercial, and school buildings, retrofits to existing buildings, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements). Construction activities would generate temporary emissions of

criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants, including diesel PM, and would vary depending on the size, phasing, and type of project.

Sources of diesel PM, the primary toxic air contaminant associated with construction activities, would include off-road construction equipment usage and diesel-powered vehicles, such as haul trucks. Given the type and scale of improvements envisioned in the CAAP (e.g., solar panel installation, building energy efficiency improvements, pedestrian and bicycle improvements, electric vehicle charging stations, etc.), as well as compliance with YSAQMD rules and regulations, construction emissions are not anticipated to result in substantial pollutant concentrations. Furthermore, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) has adopted Airborne Toxic Control Measures (ATCMs) applicable to off-road diesel equipment and portable diesel engines. The purpose of these ATCMs is to reduce emissions of PM from engines subject to the rule. The ATCMs require diesel engines to comply with PM emission limitations on a fleet-average basis. CARB has also adopted an ATCM that limits diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles idling. The rule applies to motor vehicles with gross vehicular weight ratings greater than 10,000 pounds that are licensed for on-road use. The rule restricts vehicles from idling for more than 5 minutes at any location with exceptions for idling that may be necessary in the operation of the vehicle.

Off-road diesel equipment, on-road heavy-duty diesel trucks, and portable diesel equipment used for construction associated with implementation of any CAAP measures would meet California's applicable ATCMs for control of diesel PM or nitrogen oxide in the exhaust (e.g., ATCMs for portable diesel engines, off-road vehicles, and heavy-duty on-road diesel trucks, and 5-minute diesel engine idling limits) that are in effect during the construction activities. Therefore, the short-term construction emissions would not impact any sensitive receptors for an extended period of time and the impact would be less than significant.

With respect to operational emissions, many programs to reduce GHG emissions would have the secondary benefit of reducing criteria pollutant and toxic air contaminant emissions. For example, the CAAP measures that would increase energy efficiency and expand the City's renewable and/or carbon-neutral energy portfolio to reduce GHG emissions from energy consumption, would also reduce toxic air contaminant emissions from fossil fuel combustion associated with natural gas and other fossil-fueled energy consumption. Similarly, the GHG reduction measures aimed at reducing vehicle miles traveled and promoting travel via low- and zero-emissions modes (i.e., walking, bicycling, transit, carpooling, electric vehicles, and other alternatively fueled vehicles) would also reduce criteria air pollutant and toxic air contaminant emissions from conventional-fueled vehicles. Therefore, implementation of these CAAP measures would generally reduce sensitive receptor exposure to pollutant concentrations and this impact would be less than significant.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The YSAQMD Handbook for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts (YSAQMD 2007) identifies common types of facilities that are known producers of odors which include: wastewater treatment facilities, chemical manufacturing plants, sanitary landfills, fiberglass manufacturing plants, transfer stations, painting/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), composting facilities, food processing facilities, petroleum refineries, feed lots/dairy, asphalt batch plants, and rendering plants.

The CAAP does not propose the development of any of the common types of facilities that are known producers of odors. However, the CAAP GHG reduction measures related to implementing solid waste reduction programs and carbon sequestration may include activities such as compost application, which may generate limited amounts of odor. However, as described in the CAAP, natural sequestration actions require a large amount of land area; thus, it is anticipated that such activities would occur on agricultural land within the City boundary which would typically be located at a substantial buffer distance from the nearest receptors. In addition, such activities would be subject to YSAQMD rules and regulations, such as Rule 2.5 (Nuisance). Therefore, the CAAP would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people and this impact would be less than significant.

This page intentionally left blank

3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. Biological Resources. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. The CAAP focuses on developed areas of the City with a low potential for candidate, sensitive, or special-status species. The CAAP outlines climate action goals and supporting strategies to combat climate change and includes measures and supporting efforts that commit the City to developing incentives that would encourage more high-density, mixed-use development, transit-oriented development, and affordable housing. However, the CAAP does not directly change proposed developments' land use designations or zoning. The City's General Plan determines land uses and requirements for new development, including any high-density development. The CAAP also encourages energy efficiency retrofits and investment in community solar energy and battery storage and while there is no information available that would describe the physical extent of any future renewable energy facilities, retrofits to existing buildings and renewable energy systems installed on existing and new buildings would not require ground-disturbing activities that could disturb habitat. The installation of solar panels on existing buildings may require the removal or modification of nearby trees. Removal or modification could impact nesting migratory birds, protected birds of prey, or protected bat species. However, required tree or building modification permits for future CAAP-related projects would identify such impacts and require impact avoidance measures per City standards. Additionally, the CAAP focuses on an urbanized area with low potential for interference with native wildlife species, corridors, and nursery sites. CAAP actions call for electrification of buildings, cooling and ventilation upgrades, carbon mitigation, fuel switch, electric vehicle charging, micromobility and transit, transportation demand management, and related strategies, there is no evidence that the implementation of these actions could adversely affect habitat for special status species. The impact is considered less than significant.

- b) **Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?**

No Impact. Physical changes could occur with implementation of the CAAP, such as tree planting and roadway infrastructure improvements that better match vehicular capacity to demand and improve the quality of transportation facilities for pedestrian and bicycle use; "green" stormwater infrastructure improvements that can better filter stormwater runoff; and expansion of the City's urban forest. There is no evidence that any potential future physical changes could affect any riparian areas or sensitive natural communities. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- c) **Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. The CAAP does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals nor grants any entitlements for development that would result in wetlands impacts. Impacts to federally protected waters were analyzed in the City General Plan EIR. The analysis included specific policies (Policy HAB 1.1 and HAB 1.2) that would minimize or avoid potential indirect impacts. Impacts from implementation of the CAAP would be consistent with those identified in the City General Plan EIR and would be required to implement all applicable mitigation measures from the City General Plan EIR. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.

- d) **Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. The CAAP would not interfere with wildlife movement, migratory corridors, or nursery sites. As discussed in 3.4.1.a, physical changes that would occur with implementing the CAAP, such as tree planting and light fixture improvements, would occur within the footprint of existing development and planning areas. The CAAP focuses on an urbanized area with low potential for interference with native wildlife species, corridors, and nursery sites. Future discretionary projects would be required to implement applicable mitigating policies from the City's General Plan. The impact would be less than significant.

- e) **Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

No Impact. The City Municipal Code Chapter 37 was established to preserve trees and plantings on City property and enhance the ecological benefit to the community by regulating planting, management, protection, and preservation. This code section is currently being revised as part of the Urban Forestry Management Plan (UPFM) update (anticipated adoption in March 2023); however, the revisions are not expected to change CAAP impacts to biological resources/urban forest. The CAAP promotes the expansion of urban forest in parks, greenbelts, and open spaces with climate-ready species that provide shade and develop a tree-replacement plan for street trees for all neighborhoods. Implementing proposed measures from the CAAP would benefit the City in meeting applicable local policies and ordinances for protecting biological resources. The installation of solar panels on existing buildings may require the removal or modification of nearby trees, which could include biological resources like nesting or protected birds and bats. Removal or modification could impact biological resources, such as tree preservation policies and ordinances. However, required tree or building modification permits for future CAAP-related projects would identify such impacts and

require impact avoidance measures per City standards. Therefore, the CAAP would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable policies for preserving biological resources and no impact would occur.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The purpose and intended effect of the CAAP is to reduce GHG emissions generated and help reduce the effects of climate change. The CAAP focuses on an urbanized area with low potential for interference with native wildlife species, corridors, and nursery sites. However, the Swainson's hawk and White-tailed kite are covered species under the Yolo Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP)/ Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) (2018). The installation of solar panels on existing buildings may require the removal or modification of nearby trees. Removal or modification could impact HCP/NCCP-covered species. However, required tree or building modification permits for future CAAP-related projects would identify such impacts and require impact avoidance measures. All future CAAP-related projects would be required to follow City development requirements, including compliance with local policies, ordinances, and applicable permitting procedures related to the protection of biological resources. Therefore, the CAAP does not include any physical change that would conflict with an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. The impact would be less than significant.

3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. Cultural Resources. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?**
- b) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?**
- c) **Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?**

Less than Significant. The CAAP does not propose supporting measures or actions that would directly cause adverse changes to historical or archaeological resources. Any construction activity associated with measures outlined in the CAAP would occur within the footprint of existing development. Ground disturbing activities would occur only at shallow depths in already-disturbed developed areas. Due to the nature of cultural resources, adverse impacts are site-specific and need to be determined on a project-by-project basis. In addition, incorporating standard measures addressing the response when undocumented resources are discovered would address this potential impact. The CAAP would also implement all applicable City General Plan policies (Policy HIS 1.2 and 1.3), mitigation measures from the City General Plan EIR (CR-1 and CR-2), Downtown Davis Specific Plan (Guiding Policy 1.1, 1.5, 4.3, 4.4 and 5.7), Downtown Form Based Code and the Downtown Davis Specific Plan EIR (CUL-1, CUL-2, CUL-3 and CUL-4), as applicable. If unknown and unanticipated resources are

encountered during excavation as a part of future projects, this would require compliance with the procedures in Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code and Public Resources Code 5097.98, as applicable. Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that if human remains are discovered in any place other than a dedicated cemetery, no further disturbance or excavation of the site or nearby area can occur until the county coroner has examined the remains. Public Resources Code Section 5097.94 identifies the responsibilities for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains. For these reasons, the CAAP would result in a less-than-significant impact on cultural resources.

3.6 ENERGY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. Energy. Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. The purpose and intended effect of the CAAP is to reduce GHG emissions generated in the City to help reduce the effects of climate change by encouraging alternatively fueled vehicles, reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT), using renewable energy, electrifying residential and commercial buildings, reducing waste generation, and increasing carbon sequestration. GHG reduction measures could result in the construction of small-scale construction projects, such as electric vehicle charging stations, small-scale ground-mounted or rooftop PV solar systems on residential, commercial, and school buildings; retrofits to existing buildings would not involve large amounts of labor or extensive use of construction equipment. Some worker trips and construction equipment may be required during installation of these facilities and features, resulting in the short-term consumption of diesel fuel and gasoline. Maintenance activities would be minimal and could consist of occasional inspection and cleaning of solar panels. Operational vehicle trips and associated fuel consumption would be minimal. The construction of any projects that might be associated with the CAAP would be required to comply with the energy standards in the California Energy Code of the California Building Standards Code (Title 24) (2022) and be consistent with the City Municipal Code. Furthermore, these measures would increase the supply of renewable energy and improve building energy efficiency, conserving energy in the long-term. Energy efficiency is a possible indicator of environmental impacts, though not in and of itself an environmental impact. The actual adverse physical environmental effects

associated with energy use and the efficiency of energy use are detailed throughout this Initial Study in the environmental topic-specific sections. There is no physical environmental effect associated with energy use that is not addressed in the environmental topic-specific sections of this document. The impact is less than significant.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

No Impact. The CAAP has GHG reduction measures aimed at improving energy efficiency, converting gasoline or diesel to electricity or alternative fuels, and renewable energy that would directly support the Valley Clean Energy and City's goals and strategies. The CAAP has climate reduction actions and supporting measures would generally encourage energy efficiency and conservation, as well as the use of solar energy; facilitate walking, bicycling, and use of public transit; and reduce waste generation and increase diversion away from landfills. The CAAP would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy and no impact would occur.

3.7 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. Geology and Soils. Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to California Geological Survey Special Publication 42.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**
- i) **Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to California Geological Survey Special Publication 42.)**

No Impact. Physical changes that could be associated with the implementation of the CAAP would occur within the footprint of existing development and the built environment. The CAAP calls for the adoption of regulations that would electrify building systems; research to support an ordinance requiring energy efficiency upgrades at the point of sale; incentives to encourage energy efficiency upgrades and infill development; additional solar energy generation, battery storage, and electric vehicle charging; transition to alternative fuels for the municipal fleet and disincentives for internal combustion engine vehicle use; pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements; transit improvements; transportation demand management strategies; expansion of the urban forest; and an expansion of existing cooling and weather relief centers; among other actions. The CAAP actions that could lead to physical changes are not designed or located.

The only fault in the County that has been identified as active or potentially active, and subject to surface rupture (i.e., is delineated as an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault zone) is the Hunting Creek Fault. This fault is also known as the Hunting Creek-Berryessa Fault and is located in the extreme northwestern corner of the county, more than 40 miles from the City of Davis planning area. The Dunnigan Hills Fault, which is more than 10 miles north of the City of Davis planning area, has been active during the last 11,000 years, but not within the last 200 years (Yolo County 2009). There would be no impact.

- ii) **Strong seismic ground shaking?**

No Impact. Some of the proposed measures in the CAAP would support small-scale construction projects, such as electric vehicle charging station construction. Any construction that could be related to the adoption of the CAAP would be required to adhere to seismic

standards of the California Building Code, which are designed to avoid safety and property risk associated with ground shaking. Therefore, no impact would occur.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No Impact. Due to the City's topography and lack of seismic hazards, the City General Plan EIR analysis determined ground failure, including liquefaction and landslide hazards, does not apply within the City. Physical changes that would occur through implementation of the CAAP would occur within the footprint of existing development and the built environment. Therefore, liquefaction would not represent a hazard and no impact would occur.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. As discussed in 3.7.1.iii, landslides are not anticipated to occur within the City due to the topography and lack of seismic hazards. Thus, no impact would occur.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As mentioned above, most actions included as a part of the CAAP do not have a physical component that involves construction. The physical changes that could occur through implementation of the CAAP would occur within the footprint of existing development or in existing developed areas. The City General Plan EIR analysis includes policies and ordinances that would minimize impacts associated with substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. The City General Plan policies AG-3 and HAZ-1, Regional Water Quality Control Board permit requirements and City stormwater quality control standards, as applicable. This would minimize the potential for any physical changes associated with adoption of the CAAP to significantly increase soil erosion or topsoil loss. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As discussed in 3.7.1.a and 3.7.1.b, the CAAP calls for the adoption of regulations that would electrify building systems; research to support an ordinance requiring energy efficiency upgrades at the point of sale; incentives to encourage energy efficiency upgrades and infill development; additional solar energy generation, battery storage, and electric vehicle charging; transition to alternative fuels for the municipal fleet and disincentives for internal combustion engine vehicle use; pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements; transit improvements; transportation demand management strategies; expansion of the urban forest; and an expansion of existing cooling and weather relief centers; among other actions. The CAAP actions that could lead to physical changes are not designed or located at this time, but future construction is required to comply with the California Building

Code, as adopted locally, which is designed to avoid hazards related to soil constraints and geologic conditions. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating direct or indirect substantial risks to life or property?

No Impact. As discussed in 3.7.1.b and 3.7.1.c, the CAAP primarily focuses on actions that would not involve construction. The CAAP actions that could lead to physical changes are not designed or located at this time, but future construction is required to comply with the California Building Code, as adopted locally, which is designed to avoid hazards related to soil constraints and geologic conditions. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

No Impact. Implementing the CAAP would not involve use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, no impact would occur related to soil capability support of alternative wastewater disposal systems.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

No Impact. A unique geologic feature consists of a major natural element that stands out in the landscape, such as a large and scenic river, gorge, waterfall, volcanic cinder cone, lava field, or glacier. The City's planning area is generally flat. The southern and eastern portions of Yolo County are in the relatively flat alluvial plain of the Sacramento Valley and do not include unique geologic features. The southern portion of the County consists of the Pleistocene-age Modesto-Riverbank and Red Bluff formations, which are considered highly sensitive for paleontological resources. However, as noted above and as detailed in Section 2.0, Project Description, the CAAP outlines actions to improve energy efficiency, increase the use of renewable energy and alternative transportation fuels, reduce vehicular travel demand, and other actions that do not involve excavation that could affect unique paleontological resources. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.¹

¹ Yolo County. 2009. Draft Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan Environmental Impact Report.

3.8 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Cumulatively Considerable Impact	No Impact
VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions.				
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**
- b) **Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

Less-than-Cumulatively-Considerable Impact. Considering that GHG emissions impact analysis and significance determination are established by the State legislative framework, the analysis in this section answers the two checklist questions in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G in a single impact assessment.

Certain gases in Earth’s atmosphere, classified as greenhouse gases (GHGs), play a critical role in determining the earth’s surface temperature. Solar radiation enters the earth’s atmosphere from space. A portion of the radiation is absorbed by Earth’s surface, and a smaller portion of this radiation is reflected toward space through the atmosphere. Infrared radiation is selectively absorbed by GHGs. As a result, infrared radiation released from Earth that otherwise would have escaped back into space is instead “trapped,” resulting in a warming of the atmosphere. This phenomenon, known as the “greenhouse effect,” is responsible for maintaining a habitable climate on Earth.

Global warming potential (GWP) is a concept developed to compare the ability of each GHG to trap heat in the atmosphere relative to another gas. The GWP of a GHG is based on several

factors, including the relative effectiveness of a gas to absorb infrared radiation, and length of time that the gas remains in the atmosphere (“atmospheric lifetime”). The reference gas for GWP is carbon dioxide (CO₂); therefore, CO₂ has a GWP of 1. The other main GHGs that have been attributed to human activity include methane (CH₄), which has a GWP of 27 and 29.8 for fossil and non-fossil sources, respectively, and N₂O, which has a GWP of 273 (IPCC 2021). For example, 1 ton of nitrous oxide (N₂O) has the same contribution to the greenhouse effect as approximately 273 tons of CO₂. The concept of CO₂ equivalence (CO_{2e}) is used to account for the different GWP potentials of GHGs. GHG emissions are typically measured in terms of pounds or tons of CO_{2e} and are often expressed in metric tons (MT) CO_{2e}.

Although climate change is driven by global atmospheric conditions, climate change impacts vary by region. A scientific consensus confirms that climate change effects are already being felt across the globe, including in California. As noted in the Sacramento Valley Regional Report of the California’s Fourth Climate Change Assessment (Houlton and Lund 2018), climate change is expected to make the Sacramento region hotter, drier, and increasingly prone to extremes like megadroughts, flooding, and large wildfires. These changing conditions are likely to affect water and energy availability, agricultural systems, plants and wildlife, public health, housing, and quality of life. The City’s Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment and adaptation actions address such changes.

City of Davis Climate Action and Adaptation Plan

The purpose and intended effect of the CAAP is to reduce GHG emissions generated in the City and protect public safety consistent with consistent with state goals and guidance concerning climate change. The CAAP identifies GHG reducing and climate adaptation strategies. Key actions to reduce GHG emissions include encouraging alternatively fueled vehicles, reducing VMT, using renewable energy, electrifying residential and commercial buildings, and providing for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements. The CAAP measures also include strategies for building electrification, and switching from fossil gas to electricity, renewable hydrogen, or other non-fossil renewables in all existing City facilities.

Implementation of GHG reduction measures and supporting actions could result in the construction of active transportation facilities, small-scale construction projects, such as electric vehicle charging stations, small-scale ground-mounted or rooftop PV solar systems on residential, commercial, and school buildings, and retrofits to existing buildings. Worker trips and construction equipment would be required during installation of these facilities and features, resulting in short-term GHG emissions. Following construction, operation of the proposed GHG reduction measures may also include operational and maintenance activities, such as occasional inspection and cleaning of solar panels, which may generate a minor amount of emissions. However, as detailed in Section 3.3 of the CAAP, the net result of implementation of the CAAP is a reduction in GHG emissions from existing and anticipated development and related operational activities in the City. Implementation of the CAAP would

generally reduce GHG emissions, and implementation of the CAAP would result in a less **than cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant impact of climate change.**

Proposed GHG Emissions Thresholds

In addition to the CAAP, the City has developed GHG emissions significance thresholds to be used in CEQA review. The thresholds are designed to allow the City to determine whether proposed projects provide a reasonably proportional reduction in their emissions – a fair share of the State’s overall emissions reduction targets as outlined in SB 32 and AB 1279.

The legal framework for GHG emission reductions has come about through Executive Orders, legislation, and regulations. Executive Order S-3-05, issued in recognition of California’s vulnerability to the effects of climate change, set forth the following target dates by which statewide GHG emissions would be progressively reduced: by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels; by 2020, reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; and by 2050, reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels. In 2006, California passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32; California Health and Safety Code Division 25.5, Sections 38500, et seq.). AB 32 further details and puts into law the mid-term GHG reduction target established in Executive Order S-3-05: reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. In April 2015, Governor Edmund Brown issued an executive order establishing a statewide GHG reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. This 2030 emissions reduction target acts as an interim goal between the AB 32 goal (i.e., achieve 1990 emission levels by 2020) and Governor Brown’s Executive Order S-3-05 goal of reducing statewide emissions 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. In addition, the executive order aligns California’s 2030 GHG reduction goal with the European Union’s reduction target (i.e., 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030) that was adopted in October 2014. Approval of SB 32 in September 2016 extended the provisions of AB 32 from 2020 to 2030 with a new target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. Most recently, signed September 16, 2022, AB 1279, the California Climate Crisis Act, declares the policy of the state both to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions as soon as possible, but no later than 2045, and achieve and maintain net negative greenhouse gas emissions thereafter. It also requires that by 2045 statewide anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions are reduced to at least 85 percent below statewide 1990 levels.

The City’s GHG emissions thresholds are consistent with, and supportive of, the State legislative framework for GHG emissions reduction, in a way that is appropriate for projects located in Davis, and that is appropriate for new development. Furthermore, the thresholds are for the purpose of evaluating the environmental impact of a project and adoption of the thresholds would not result in any physical environmental change, and therefore would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact.

Bright-Line Threshold

The City's bright-line threshold is set at a level that represents a screening level for smaller projects that would not represent a cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact of greenhouse gas emissions to global climate change. Projects using the bright-line threshold should add annual amortized construction emissions to total annual operational emissions to compare to the threshold.

The bright-line threshold was developed by using a level of 1,100 MT CO_{2e} per year in the year 2020, and then reducing this level of emissions by 85 percent between 2020 and 2045, consistent with the target included as a part of AB 1279. Regarding this mass emissions level – a 1,100 MT threshold was estimated to capture 98 percent of total GHG emissions of projects reviewed under an Initial Study or Environmental Impact Report in Sacramento County (SMAQMD 2014, 2020). This means that starting with this threshold – 1,100 MT CO_{2e} per year – would require feasible mitigation for projects accounting for nearly all GHG emissions. As noted previously, AB 1279 requires 1990 statewide emissions to be reduced by 85 percent by 2045. Therefore, to ensure consistency with AB 1279 as the most recent representation of the State's legislative framework for GHG emissions reduction, the City's proposed bright-line threshold decreases for each year between 2020 and 2045 at the same rate – 85 percent between 2020 and 2045. As noted previously, AB 32 required statewide emissions in 2020 to be at 1990 levels – a target that was achieved in California. Therefore, to ensure consistency with AB 1279 as the most recent representation of the State's legislative framework for GHG emissions reduction, the City's proposed bright-line threshold decreases for each year between 2020 and 2045 at the linear rate to achieve an 85 percent from 1,100 MT in 2020 to 165 MT in 2045. Projects with emissions that would not exceed this bright-line threshold would result in a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact of global climate change.

Efficiency-Based Threshold

As with the bright-line threshold, the City's efficiency-based threshold of 2.88 MT CO_{2e} per service population per year allows the City to assess whether a proposed would have a less than cumulatively considerable or a cumulatively considerable impact. Projects should add amortized annual construction emissions to annual operational emissions to compare with the efficiency-based threshold.

Instead of a total emissions level, the efficiency-based threshold specifies a level of emissions per service population. Service population is equivalent to the total residential population and total full-time equivalent employment estimated for a project. To construct the efficiency-based threshold, one must determine an emissions "budget" for each resident and employee – and this budget must represent an emissions rate that is consistent with, and does not conflict with the State's legislative framework for reducing GHG emissions.

Since the efficiency-based threshold is a ratio that includes population + employment in the denominator of this ratio, it is primarily intended to be used for residential, retail, commercial services, professional office, and other projects that are primarily focused on residential development or new local employment. For development projects, particularly when considering more near-term targets, such as that of the State’s 2030 target for 40 percent below 1990 levels, it is also important to evaluate whether a subject project “incorporates efficiency and conservation measures sufficient to contribute its portion of the overall greenhouse gas reductions necessary” for the State to achieve its own mandates (*Center for Biological Diversity, et al. v. California Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Newhall Land and Farming Company*, California Supreme Court, Case No. 5217763). If a project demonstrates that the *rate* of GHG emissions is efficient enough to provide its share of State emissions reduction targets, the impact is not cumulatively considerable (*Center for Biological Diversity, et al. v. California Department of Fish and Wildlife*; Crockett 2011). The City’s efficiency-based threshold offers just this – the local rate of GHG emissions for new development Davis, at the project level, that would result in a less than cumulatively considerable contribution to the significant cumulative impact of global climate change.

To develop the efficiency target for a project with pre-2030 initial operation years, the statewide mass emissions target for 2030 required under SB 32 is divided by the forecast population and employment statewide for 2030. This yields an emissions budget for each resident and employee that is consistent with the State emissions reduction mandate for 2030. To tailor this threshold for use by the City, the statewide mass emissions target, population, and employment were adjusted to focus on the emissions sources that occur within Davis. Emissions sources and jobs that are not relevant for Davis were removed from consideration in developing the efficiency-based threshold so that when projects in Davis use this threshold, it provides an accurate reflection of what the fair share of emissions reduction should be for each subject project. For example, geological and petroleum technicians, and aircraft mechanics and service technician jobs were removed from consideration since these jobs do not exist in Davis. Emission sources were also tailored in developing this efficiency-based threshold – for example, emissions related to agriculture and forestry, mining, petroleum refining, and waterborne transportation emissions were removed from consideration since these emissions do not exist in Davis.

The following bullets present the statewide emissions, statewide emissions from sources that occur locally, population, and employment figures, and calculates the proposed 2030 GHG efficiency-based threshold.

- ▶ 1990 statewide emissions: 431 MMT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 1990 statewide emissions, removing emissions sources that do not occur in Davis: 293 MMT CO₂e/year

- ▶ 2030 statewide emissions to achieve SB 32 reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 emissions: 259 MMT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2030 statewide emissions to achieve SB 32 reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 emissions, considering only emissions sources that occur in Davis: 176 MMT CO₂e/year
- ▶ 2030 statewide population: 41,860,459
- ▶ 2030 statewide employment: 20,611,658
- ▶ 2030 statewide service population (population + employment): 61,042,493
- ▶ 2030 statewide emissions required to achieve SB 32 reduction target, divided by 2030 service population: 2.88

If a proposed project would achieve this threshold, it would demonstrate a GHG emissions rate that would be consistent with the State legislative framework for GHG emissions reductions, including the SB 32 reduction target for 2030, and substantial progress toward the State's long-term goal of carbon neutrality by 2045. Continued statewide reduction measures implemented as a part of the Air Resources Board Scoping Plan would apply both to existing, on-the-ground development, as well as to new development. This would include new development proposed within Davis. As these scoping plan reduction measures are developed and implemented, they will improve the GHG efficiency of existing and future development within Davis and throughout the state, moving the state toward the 2045 carbon neutrality goal. In addition, as the City implements the CAAP, this will also improve the GHG efficiency of both existing and new development within Davis.

3.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.				
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The CAAP does not propose any actions that would create a hazard through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. It is possible construction activities would require the use of materials that include on-site fueling/servicing of construction equipment and the transport of fuels, lubricating fluids, and solvents. These materials are not acutely hazardous, and all storage, handling, and disposal of these materials are regulated by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Occupational Safety & Health Administration and City policies. The transport, use, and disposal of construction-related hazardous materials associated with any activities that could be associated with implementation of the CAAP would occur in conformance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations governing such activities. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As discussed under a) above, the CAAP proposes the adoption of regulations that would electrify building systems; research to support an ordinance requiring energy efficiency upgrades at the point of sale; incentives to encourage energy efficiency upgrades and infill development; additional solar energy generation, battery storage, and electric vehicle charging; transition to alternative fuels for the municipal fleet and disincentives for internal combustion engine vehicle use; pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements; transit improvements; transportation demand management strategies; expansion of the urban forest; and an expansion of existing cooling and weather relief centers; among other actions. Implementation of the CAAP could result in renovating older residential, commercial, and municipal structures to support energy retrofits and installing private and municipal solar PV systems. Structures built prior to 1978 may contain asbestos-containing building materials and lead paint. If not properly handled and released into the environment in

large enough quantities, these materials could pose a threat to construction workers and residents. However, these retrofits would primarily be limited in scale and no single renovation would likely result in large releases to pose a health hazard to the general public. In addition, demolition and construction activities involving hazardous materials removal are regulated, and construction workers must comply with applicable federal and state safety regulations and Rule 9.9 administered by the Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District, which sets the regulations on testing, surveying, and removal of potential asbestos-containing materials. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The CAAP proposes no action that would involve hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. As outlined under b), above, the types of physical change that could be associated with the CAAP do not involve emissions of hazardous material, and in fact, some aspects of implementation of the CAAP could help to reduce toxic air contaminants through fuel switch to more clean and renewable sources. Any future action with the potential for hazardous emissions or waste would be subject to environmental review at that time. Implementation of the CAAP would be guided by California DTSC, United States EPA, Occupational Safety & Health Administration and City policies. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

D) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Less-than-Significant Impact. According to the DTSC and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), hazardous materials sites are located throughout the City (SWRCB 2022).¹ The CAAP calls for the adoption of regulations that would electrify building systems; research to support an ordinance requiring energy efficiency upgrades at the point of sale; incentives to encourage energy efficiency upgrades and infill development; additional solar energy generation, battery storage, and electric vehicle charging; transition to alternative fuels for the municipal fleet and disincentives for internal combustion engine vehicle use; pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements; transit improvements; transportation demand management strategies; expansion of the urban forest; and an expansion of existing cooling and weather relief centers; among other actions. The CAAP actions that could lead to physical changes are not designed or located at this time, but future construction is required to comply with relevant federal and state regulations designed to avoid public health and environmental impacts. Due diligence required for financing of property acquisition would typically uncover any hazardous materials issues. In addition, the CAAP has not identified the location of any particular project

¹ State Water Resources Control Board Geotracker: <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>.

sites for actions that could be associated with implementation. The impact is considered less than significant.

- e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?**

No Impact. There is only one airport in the City: University of California (UC) Davis Airport. The UC Davis Airport is a general aviation airport and offers the sale of aviation fuel, rental hangars, open shades, and tie-downs for aircraft storage. The CAAP does not propose any land use or zoning changes related to airports, airstrips, or heliports, nor does it include any development that would increase exposure to excessive noise levels associated with airports, airstrips, or heliports. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- f) **Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. The CAAP identifies a need for additional infill housing, mixed-use, and transit-orient development in addition to several measures to increase the urban forest and other GHG-reduction upgrades to existing facilities and infrastructure within the City. Physical changes that could be associated with implementing the CAAP are anticipated to occur within the footprint of existing development. The CAAP does not propose any measures or actions that would physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- g) **Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?**

No Impact. According to California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFIRE), the City is not located in designated California Fire Hazard Severity Zones or in a State Responsibility Area (CalFIRE).² Furthermore, the CAAP does not propose specific development or other physical changes that could be put at risk in the case of a wildland fire. Therefore, no impact would occur related to risks associated with exposure to wildland fires.

² Please see the AL CalFIRE Fire Hazard Severity Zones Maps for more detail: <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/wildland-hazards-building-codes/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps/>.

3.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. Hydrology and Water Quality. Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Physical changes that could be associated with implementing the CAAP are anticipated to occur within the footprint of existing development where there is currently a high percentage of impervious surfaces. The CAAP does not propose to add surface parking or other impervious surfaces that could increase urban runoff in areas where pollutants could be carried into stormwater. The CAAP does propose actions that, depending on their implementation, could have benefits for surface or groundwater quality.

The CAAP proposes that the City promote climate-ready private landscapes, such as installing drought tolerant, native, climate-ready plants and/or xeriscaping; programs that support turf removal; installing rainwater capture and harvesting equipment; and the use of green stormwater measures to enhance natural water infiltration. The CAAP proposes that the City expand urban forest in parks, greenbelts, and open space with climate-ready species that provide shade, and develop a tree-replacement plan for street trees for all neighborhoods. The CAAP proposes that the City develop policies to increase the use of green stormwater infrastructure and enhance natural water infiltration in public infrastructure and aggressively implement important existing climate-related efforts, such as stormwater management policies, the 2023 update to the Urban Forestry Management Plan (UFMP), water conservation programs, and an expansion of the City’s urban forest.

Implementation of the CAAP, such as design guidelines related to pedestrian, bike, and transit connectivity, could result in developing bicycle paths or expanding pedestrian and transit amenities, which could require some earth disturbance. Although implementation of the CAAP would not substantially increase the amount of runoff or pollutants in the runoff, if necessary, implementing the CAAP would require compliance with NPDES to control stormwater discharges. When appropriate, any project associated with the CAAP would be subject to a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and/or be required to incorporate Best Management Practices during construction to reduce potential impacts. Potential water quality impacts

associated with the build-out of the City were analyzed in the City General Plan and addressed with policies, strategies, and mitigation measures that would protect and reduce potential impacts on water quality. Implementation of the CAAP would be guided by policies in the City General Plan (Policy WATER 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 4.1 and 4.2). The impact is less than significant.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As discussed under a), above, the CAAP does not propose large expanses of impervious surfaces, including in areas that are important for groundwater recharge. The CAAP includes actions to create incentives for infill housing and mixed-use development, but this would occur in already developed areas, and the scale, character, and location of future development that might occur as a result of these incentives is not currently known. Any future development within the City would be guided by applicable policies and programs oriented toward protecting groundwater resources (see City General Plan Policies WATER 1.1, 2.3, and 4.2). Therefore, the impact is less than significant.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

- i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**
- ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?**
- iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. As discussed under a) and b), above, the CAAP does not propose large expanses of impervious surfaces or other actions that would generate substantial erosion, increase stormwater runoff, or exceed the capacity of drainage systems and, in fact, includes actions, as discussed under a), above, that could have a benefit for erosion and runoff. The CAAP focuses on urbanized areas of the City with low potential for alteration of existing drainage patterns, erosion or siltation, and surface runoff that would result in flooding and create or contribute runoff water. The CAAP includes supporting measures and actions to encourage future mixed-use and transit-oriented development but does not directly change land use designations or zoning of proposed developments. The General Plan determines land uses and requirements for new development, including mixed-use and transit-oriented development. In addition, a majority of the proposed measures involve replacing and retrofitting existing structures and streetlights, which would not alter existing drainage patterns.

Applicable City General Plan policies (see Policy WATER 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.3 and 3.2) would guide future development. Therefore, improvements and development consistent with the CAAP would not substantially alter existing drainage patterns. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

No Impact. See the discussion under a) and b), above. Physical changes through implementing the CAAP would occur within the footprint of existing development and the built environment. The CAAP encourages the City to pursue mixed-use and transit-oriented development but does not directly change land use designations or zoning of proposed developments. Any future development within the City would be guided by General Plan (Policy WATER 3.2 and 4.2). Therefore, no impact would occur.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

No Impact. The City is not located within a designated seiche or tsunami zone. The CAAP does not recommend any measure resulting in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or flood hazard. Therefore, no impact would occur.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

No Impact. See the discussion under a) and b), above. The CAAP measures would not include direct groundwater extraction and encourage water savings through conservation. The CAAP would not interfere with or obstruct the implementation of water quality standards, waste discharge requirements, or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. Therefore, no impact would occur.

3.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. Land Use and Planning. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. Implementation of the CAAP would enhance pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connectivity and would commit the City to developing incentives for housing, mixed-use, and transit-oriented development. Future developments would occur in infill settings, and the City anticipates no barriers introduced in neighborhoods or associated infrastructure improvements that could divide any community. Implementing the CAAP intends to increase connectivity throughout the City by implementing both external and internal design guidelines for bike, pedestrian, and transit connectivity, which would connect existing residential development to nearby sidewalks and transit stops. Therefore, there is no impact.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

No Impact. The CAAP is a policy document that, if adopted, would be intended to reduce environmental impacts. All future CAAP-related projects would be required to follow City requirements, including compliance with local policies, ordinances, and applicable permitting procedures. There is no impact.

This page intentionally left blank

3.12 MINERAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. Mineral Resources. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

No Impact. The City General Plan indicates that the most important mineral resources in the region are sand and gravel, which are mined on Cache Creek and other channels in Yolo County. A survey of aggregate resources by the State Division of Mines and Geology showed no significant aggregate resources in the City. The only mineral resource known to exist in the City is natural gas, but resource areas have not been identified. There is no impact.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

No Impact. As discussed in a), above, there are no known mineral resource areas in the City. Therefore, no impact would occur.

This page intentionally left blank

3.13 NOISE AND VIBRATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. Noise and Vibration. Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. The CAAP does not directly propose activities that would generate excessive amounts of noise. Construction activity associated with implementing CAAP measures could result in temporary noise levels. However, most of the actions could involve some use of construction equipment that could generate noise, and depending on the location of the activities, could occur near noise-sensitive uses. The CAAP calls for energy-efficiency retrofits, building electrification, and streetlight replacement, along with an expansion of the electric vehicle charging network, additional solar energy generation and battery storage. The CAAP also commits the City to develop incentives intended to encourage infill housing, mixed-use, and transit-oriented development. Future activities requiring discretionary

review would, as applicable, conduct project-specific environmental review with the City, including enforcement of existing requirements to mitigate environmental impacts (such as traffic impact fees, grading permit conditions, etc.), and General Plan policies (City General Plan Policy NOISE 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4). Future activities would also be required to comply with the City's noise ordinance (City Municipal Code Chapter 24, Noise Regulations), which includes noise level during construction which shall not exceed 86 dBA between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on Mondays through Fridays and between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays. Such compliance would reduce noise levels associated with construction activities. The CAAP does not propose large construction projects that would have long construction schedules or that would involve substantial excavation or earthwork, which is typically the construction phase involving the highest levels of noise generation. The CAAP does not include any actions that would lead to substantial increases in operational noise levels. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As discussed above in a), construction activities have the potential to result in varying degrees of temporary and short-term ground vibration during small-scale construction, depending on the type of construction equipment utilized. The CAAP does not propose large construction projects that would have long construction schedules or that would involve substantial excavation or earthwork, the need for pile driving, the use of large bulldozers directly adjacent to vibration sensitive uses, or the need for loaded heavy duty trucks directly adjacent to vibration sensitive uses. The CAAP does not include any actions that would cause operational vibration. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. There are no private airstrips within City limits. The CAAP does not propose any actions that would expose people to excessive noise levels near the UC Davis Airport. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

3.14 POPULATION AND HOUSING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. Population and Housing. Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

No Impact. The purpose of the CAAP is to reduce GHG emissions through methods such as alternative fuels, alternative transportation, and energy efficiency but does not propose development, infrastructure, or any other actions that would induce population growth. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. As discussed in 3.14.1.a, the CAAP is a policy document consistent with the General Plan and the recently adopted Downtown Davis Specific Plan (2022). Implementation of the CAAP would commit the City to developing incentives for housing, mixed-use, and transit-oriented development. Future developments would occur in infill settings, but the City does not anticipate that future development that could be potentially facilitated through these future incentives would displace substantial numbers of people or housing. The impact is less than significant.

This page intentionally left blank

3.15 PUBLIC SERVICES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. Public Services. Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:**
- **Fire protection?**
 - **Police protection?**
 - **Schools?**
 - **Parks?**
 - **Other public facilities?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. The City General Plan EIR analyzed the impacts of changes to public facilities and services, including fire protection, police protection, parks, and other public facilities (City General Plan Policy POLFIRE 1, 1.2, 3 and Y&E 8.1, 8.1k, 9, and POS 1, 3, 4, 6). The CAAP reduction measures include vehicle and equipment fuel conversion to zero-emission, building energy efficiency improvements, small-scale renewable energy installation, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements. However, the CAAP does not directly propose any reduction measures or implement actions that would induce population growth or change existing development such that there would be a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities. The CAAP commits the City to developing incentives for infill housing, mixed-use, and transit-oriented development, but the City does not anticipate these future incentives would lead to such a large amount of development that additional public facility construction would be required that would itself lead to any significant adverse environmental effect. The impact is less than significant.

3.16 RECREATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. Recreation.				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. The CAAP does not directly propose any reduction measures or implement actions that would induce population growth or change existing development such that there would be a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities. The CAAP commits the City to developing incentives for infill housing, mixed-use, and transit-oriented development, but the City does not anticipate these future incentives would lead to such a large amount of development that would lead to an increase in use of parks or recreation facilities that would lead to substantial physical deterioration. The CAAP measures promote the expansion of the current bicycle and pedestrian path network, which would provide additional passive recreational facilities within the City. The CAAP also proposes planting trees in parks and greenbelts to enhance recreation spaces. The impact is less than significant.

- b) **Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

No Impact. As discussed in 3.16.2.a, the CAAP does not propose measures or actions that would require the construction or expansion of recreation facilities. Therefore, no impact would occur.

3.17 TRANSPORTATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. Transportation. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

No Impact. Implementation of the CAAP would enhance pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connectivity and would commit the City to developing incentives for housing, mixed-use, and transit-oriented development. The CAAP proposes that the City develop a shared electric micromobility program and charging plan, providing additional resources for the Safe Routes to School program, or other actions; to subsidize public transit so it is free for all to use and promote expansion of public transit routes and increased operation frequency within Davis to support day-to-day travel needs. The CAAP proposes improvements in existing right-of-way, such as road diets that decrease the capacity or width of the vehicular portion of travelways and reductions in pedestrian crossing distances. The CAAP proposes to coordinate with regional transit agencies and cities to promote cohesive transit interconnections, including express buses to Woodland, West Sacramento, and Sacramento and to revisit the City's parking pricing study. Finally, the CAP propose to develop a Transportation Demand

Management (TDM) program to encourage remote work opportunities, community education and outreach, micromobility, vanpool, rideshare, subsidized transit, and employee parking cash-out. These actions are consistent with other policies and plans that are intended to reduce transportation impacts. The GHG reduction measures in the CAAP promote a reduction in VMT and are consistent with the General Plan Transportation Element and the Beyond Platinum Bicycle Action Plan (the City of Davis Bicycle Action Plan), which are intended to promote a range of viable travel choices; environmental and economic sustainability in the transportation system; a safe and convenient complete street network that serves everyone; and bicycling as a healthy, affordable, efficient, and low-impact mode of transportation. There is no impact.

b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

No Impact. The referenced section provides guidance for the analysis of travel demand impacts. This section of the CEQA Guidelines suggests that VMT are the most appropriate measure of travel demand impacts. It also clarifies that a project's effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact. The CAAP focuses on encouraging alternative transportation modes and reducing VMT. These strategies and measures would benefit alternative transportation and would be consistent with CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.3(b). There is no impact.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Future projects that would occur with implementing the CAAP would primarily be constructed in developed areas or along existing roadways and would not change the existing configuration of the roadways. The proposed actions and supporting measures included in the CAAP aim to provide alternative modes of transportation and reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled throughout the City. GHG measures that encourage a shift in transportation modes and reduction in travel demand would result in minor changes to the existing streetscape. Any streetscape improvements involving pedestrian and bicycle facilities would be required to comply with City public improvement standards and street standards, which are designed to avoid any increase in hazards due to geometric design features or incompatible uses. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact. The CAAP does not include any changes to the access provided by the City's transportation network. Any future development requiring discretionary approval would be required to comply with applicable General Plan policies (Policy TRANS 2.9). There is no impact.

3.18 TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:**
- i) **Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k).**
 - ii) **A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?**

No Impact. The CAAP does not propose any site-specific development that could impact identified or unidentified historical, archaeological, or tribal resources or human remains. However, implementation of some measures could result in future projects that involve ground-disturbing activities and building alteration, but there are no specific projects identified and thus no specific location, size, or design to evaluate. Additionally, any construction activity associated with measures outlined in the CAAP would occur within the footprint of existing developed areas. Projects that require discretionary approval will be required to be consistent with applicable City General Plan policies (Policy HIS 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3). In August of 2022, the City requested a list of potentially interested Native American tribal representative and a search of the Sacred Lands File from the Native American Heritage Commission. On October 14th, the Native American Heritage Commission replied with a list of contacts and indication that the search of the Sacred Lands File was negative for the City of Davis. Based on previous interactions on past projects, on August 19th, 2022, the City had sent invitations to the Cortina Rancheria – Kletsel Dehe Band of Wintun Indians, Lone Band of Miwok Indians, and Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation. No tribal contacts requested consultation. There are no known Tribal Cultural Resources in Davis. There is no impact.

3.19 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems. Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. The purpose and intended effect of the CAAP is to reduce GHG emissions generated in the City to help reduce the effects of climate change by encouraging alternatively fueled vehicles, reducing VMT, using renewable energy, residential and commercial building electrification, reducing waste generation, bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure improvements, and increasing carbon sequestration. These measures could result in the construction of relatively small-scale construction projects, such as electric vehicle charging stations, small-scale ground-mounted or rooftop PV solar systems on residential, commercial, and public buildings, and retrofits to existing buildings. The CAAP commits the City to developing incentives for infill housing, mixed-use, and transit-oriented development, but the City does not anticipate these future incentives would lead to such a large amount of development that utility expansions or extensions would be required that would itself lead to any significant adverse environmental effect. The impact is less than significant.

- b) **Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. The CAAP encourages the City to promote mixed-use and transit-oriented development in future planning. The CAAP proposes that the City expand urban forest in parks, greenbelts, and open space with climate-ready species that provide shade, and develop a tree-replacement plan for street trees for all neighborhoods, which could require some water, but could also increase groundwater infiltration and supply. The CAAP proposes that the City develop policies to increase the use of green stormwater infrastructure and enhance natural water infiltration in public infrastructure and aggressively implement important existing climate-related efforts, such as stormwater management policies, the 2023 update to the Urban Forestry Management Plan (UFMP), water conservation programs, and an expansion of the City's urban forest. Future projects related to the implementation of the CAAP would be required to be consistent with General Plan policies (Policy WATER 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 2.1) to reduce future potential impacts. The impact is less than significant.

- c) **Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**

No Impact. As discussed in a), above, the CAAP commits the City to developing incentives for infill housing, mixed-use, and transit-oriented development, but the City does not anticipate these future incentives would lead to such a large amount of development that would substantially increase wastewater demand. The CAAP does not propose measures or actions

that would result in the construction of new water or wastewater facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, no impact would occur.

d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

No Impact. The CAAP includes supporting measures and actions to reduce waste generation and increase diversion away from landfills. Solid waste in the City would be reduced as a result of the implementation of the CAAP. As discussed above, the CAAP encourages the City to pursue mixed-use and transit-oriented development. There is no impact.

e) Comply with federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact. The CAAP does not recommend any measure that does not comply with applicable solid waste regulations. Conversely, the CAAP proposes a measure that would reduce waste generation and increase diversion away from landfills, and would comply with state and local regulations. There is no impact.

This page intentionally left blank

3.20 WILDFIRE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. Wildfire. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

- a) **Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**
- b) **Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?**
- c) **Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?**

- d) **Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?**

No Impact. According to the CalFIRE, the City is not located in or near designated California Fire Hazard Severity Zones or in a State Responsibility Area (CalFIRE 2022).¹ There is no impact.

¹ Please see the CalFIRE Fire Hazard Severity Zones Maps for more detail: <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/wildland-hazards-building-codes/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps/>.

3.21 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Cumulatively Considerable Contribution	No Impact
XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance.				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a 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.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083, 21083.5.

Reference: Government Code Sections 65088.4.

Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21083, 21083.3, 21083.5, 21093, 21094, 21095, 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino* (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

DISCUSSION

- a) **Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. The CAAP identifies climate actions and supporting measures to reduce GHG emissions. The CAAP proposes measures to lessen numerous environmental impacts and does not contain any strategy or measure that would either directly substantially reduce habitat, reduce wildlife populations, threaten animal or plant communities, restrict the range of species, or eliminate examples of history or prehistory. All impacts analyzed in this Initial Study regarding biology and cultural resources have been determined to be less-than-significant or no impact. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- b) **Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a 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.)**

Less-than-Cumulatively Considerable Impact. The purpose of the CAAP is to reduce GHG emissions to help meet the City’s goals and the State’s legislative mandates. While climate change is a significant cumulative impact related to past, present, and future projects, the CAAP would ensure a less than cumulatively considerable contribution. The CAAP proposes that the City develop programs and guidance to promote fuel switch to more sustainable fuels, energy efficiency improvements, actions to improve resiliency, reduce vehicular travels, and related actions. The impacts of such actions, as they are carried out by the City during the CAAP timeline, would not represent any cumulatively considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impact.

- c) **Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. None of the measures or actions proposed by the CAAP would result in significant impacts under any environmental impact regarding adverse effects on humans analyzed in this Initial Study. Implementation of the CAAP would potentially result in a decrease in certain human impacts, such as those regarding transportation and air quality. It is possible there would be minor construction-related, short-term impacts from tree planting, electrification of buildings, road diets, expansion of the electric vehicle charging network, and light fixture upgrades. The CAAP also would commit the City to developing incentives for infill housing, mixed-use, and transit-oriented development, but each individual development project

would be analyzed to determine adverse impacts on a project basis and need for any necessary mitigation at that time. Implementation of the CAAP would not cause direct or indirect substantial adverse effects on human beings. This would be a less-than-significant impact.

This page intentionally left blank

4 REFERENCES

- CalFIRE. 2022. "Fire Hazard Severity Zones Map."
<https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/wildland-hazards-building-codes/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps/>.
- California Department of Transportation. 2018. "California State Scenic Highway System Map."
<https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>.
- California Energy Code of the California Building Standards Code (Title 24). 2022.
<https://codes.iccsafe.org/content/CABC2022P1>.
- City of Davis. 2000. "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, 2000)". Available at: <http://cityofdavis.org/city-hall/community-development-and-sustainability/planning-andzoning/general-plan-eir>.
- _____. 2007. "City of Davis General Plan."
<https://www.cityofdavis.org/home/showpublisheddocument/3684/635753983759370000>.
- _____. 2022. "Draft Urban Forestry Management Plan." <https://www.cityofdavis.org/city-hall/urban-forestry/city-of-davis-urban-forest-management-plan>.
- _____. 2022. "City of Davis Downtown Davis Specific Plan and Form Based Code EIR."
https://documents.cityofdavis.org/Media/Default/Documents/PDF/CDD/Advance-Planning/Downtown-Plan/EIR/DEIR/Draft-EIR_DowntownDavisSpecificPlan-and-FormBasedCode_July2022.pdf.
- _____. 2022. "City of Davis Downtown Davis Specific Plan." <https://www.cityofdavis.org/city-hall/community-development-and-sustainability/planning-and-zoning/downtown-davis-plan/draft-specific-plan-and-comments>.
- Crockett, Alexander G. 2011 (January). Addressing the Significance of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Under CEQA: California's Search for Regulatory Certainty in an Uncertain World. Golden Gate University Environmental Law Journal, Volume 4, Issue 2, Pacific Region Edition.
- Houlton, Benjamin, Jay Lund. (University of California, Davis). 2018. Sacramento Summary Report. Available: https://www.energy.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2019-11/Reg_Report-SUM-CCCA4-2018-002_SacramentoValley_ADA.pdf. Accessed February 13, 2023.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2021. AR6 Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Available: <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/>. Accessed February 14, 2023.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). 2014. Justification for Greenhouse Gas Emissions Thresholds of Significance. Available: <https://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/GHGThresholdsJustificationSept2014.pdf>. Accessed February 13, 2023.

_____. 2020. Greenhouse Gas Thresholds for Sacramento County. Prepared by Ramboll.

State Water Resources Control Board. "GeoTracker." <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>.

Yolo County. 2009. Draft Yolo County 2030 Countywide General Plan Environmental Impact Report.

Yolo HCP/NCCP. 2018. "Yolo Habitat Conservation Plan / Natural Community Conservation Plan." <https://www.yolohabitatconservancy.org/documents>.

YSAQMD. 2007. "Handbook for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts." <https://www.ysaqmd.org/wp-content/uploads/Planning/CEQAHandbook2007.pdf>.

_____. 2013. "Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District. PM2.5 Implementation/Maintenance Plan and Redesignation Request for Sacramento PM2.5 Nonattainment Area." <https://www.airquality.org/ProgramCoordination/Documents/PM2.5%20Imp%20and%20Redesignation%202013.pdf>.

_____. 2017. "Sacramento Regional 2008 NAAQS 8-Hour Ozone Attainment and Reasonable Further Progress Plan." <https://www.ysaqmd.org/wp-content/uploads/Planning/Sac-Regional-2008-NAAQS-Attainment-and-RFP-Plan.pdf>.