

September 8, 2020

Matt Dulcich, AICP
Director of Environmental Planning
Campus Planning and Environmental Stewardship
University of California, One Shields Avenue
Davis, CA 95616
environreview@ucdavis.edu

Mr. Dulcich,

The Tahoe Park Neighborhood Association (TPNA) Land Use Committee (LUC) has reviewed the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (DSEIR) for the University of California, Davis 2020 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Update. While the expansion of the health care campus that sits south and east of the Tahoe Park Neighborhood has the potential to be a regional asset, after our review of the DSEIR, the LUC believes that the project will have significant and negative hydrology and water quality, population and housing, and transportation and circulation impacts. For these impact areas, the analysis is deficient or the proposed mitigation measures are not sufficient to lessen the impacts of the project. We recognize that the DSEIR identifies significant and unavoidable impacts to regional transit and air quality, however, similar to the aforementioned impact areas, the DSEIR needs to include mitigation that is of equal degree to the scope of the impacts identified. Additionally, this document transfers the responsibility to mitigate impacts from campus expansion to other agencies (i.e., Sacramento Regional Transit and City of Sacramento) with no tangible support from University of California Davis (UCD), which is unacceptable. Follows are TPNA's comments on the DSEIR.

Impact LRDP-AQ-2: Cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment area for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

Table 3.15-2 provides data of the observed mode of trips generated by the Sacramento campus. However, "because UC Davis Health has not conducted a recent survey of existing providers, employees, or students to quantify existing commute travel modes," and because "the higher pedestrian volume is likely not indicative of a higher pedestrian mode share," it is concluded that the analysis in this section does not have the necessary data to confirm the modality of trips to and from the Sacramento Campus.

There are several issues with this analysis. First, without data to support the mode share of trips generated by the Sacramento campus, it is speculative to assert that mitigation measure LRDP-AQ-2e "will contribute to mobile source emissions reductions." Additionally, "the effectiveness of Mitigation Measure LRDP-TRA-2e is dependent on the cooperation of visitors, employees, patients, and vendors visiting the plan area," which also calls into the question the legitimacy of this mitigation measure.

Although impact LRDP-AQ-2 is identified as a significant and unavoidable impact, UCD is obligated to do its fair share to obtain valid data on the mode split of trips generated by the campus to measure the projects air quality impacts both now and in the future. Specifically, this impact must include a mitigation measure that requires UCD to conduct a bi-annual survey of employees, students, and residents to discern their travel behavior and the effectiveness of UCD implemented programs to reduce operational PM10 emissions. The mitigation must specify that the survey use a census or representative sample, as opposed to a convenience sample. A representative survey will also provide a means for UCD to determine if the campus is meeting the UCD Sustainable Practices Policy to reduce the percentage of employees and students commuting by single occupancy vehicle (SOV) by 10% relative to its 2015 SOV commute rates by 2025, which is in the timeframe for build out of the long range development plan. While operational

PM10 emissions will result from vendor and visitor trips too, UCD can reasonably collect trip mode share from the employees, students and residents who will account for 73% of projected daily onsite population on campus as outlined in table 2-1.

Additionally, this impact should also include a Mitigation Measure requiring UCD to purchase air quality monitors for installation in the project area that lack air quality monitors to offset the air quality impacts caused by the project.

Mitigation Measure LRDP-AQ-2e, Reduce operational PM10 emissions: Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure, e & f:

UCD plans to include crosswalks, count-down signal timers, curb extensions, channelization islands, speed tables, raised crosswalks, raised intersections, median islands, tight corner radii, traffic circles or mini-circles as site design related sub-measures on campus to reduce operational PM10 emissions. This portion of the mitigation measure outlines UCD “coordinating with the City of Sacramento (City) to encourage these features on external roads connecting to campus.”

Coordinating and encouraging is vague and not an effective mitigation to reduce operational PM10. This mitigation measure should be revised to read that UCD will pay the costs of a study to discern appropriate traffic calming features on external roads connecting to campus. Furthermore, UCD shall pay a fair share ratio to construct the traffic calming features identified through the study. Why should the City be on the hook to pay for traffic calming measures to reduce the impacts of the campus expansion?

3.15 Transportation and Circulation:

The DSEIR concludes that the project’s vehicle miles traveled (VMT) impact is less than significant because the project is in a low VMT area per the mapping analysis conducted by Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) for the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) for both employment and household VMT, and thus is exempt from doing further transportation impact analysis under newly adopted VMT CEQA guidelines. This is based on the OPR Technical Advisory finding that residential and office projects that locate in areas with low VMT, tend to exhibit similarly low VMT. This conclusion is in direct conflict with analysis and impact conclusions detailed in the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas emissions of the DSEIR. Those sections of the DSEIR state, “while reducing trip distances is consistent with SB 743, the overall growth in VMT under the 2020 LRDP Update is projected to outpace campus population, leading to an increase in daily per capita VMT” and further that “The 2020 LRDP Update would generate additional VMT compared to existing conditions (Hananouchi pers. Comm).”

UCD is not exempt from mitigating the CEQA impacts under the VMT CEQA guidelines in the Transportation section. A “presumption” of less than significant cannot be found when the analysis in the preceding sections finds that there will be a significant increase in VMT. The Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Section of the DSEIR are inconsistent and in conflict with the transportation and circulation sections.

Impact LRDP-TRA-1: Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.

The DSEIR states that planned improvements on Broadway west of Stockton Boulevard would likely, “reduce vehicle travel speeds and improve bicyclists’ comfort, resulting in greater facilitation of bicycle travel.” The conclusion that a yet to be constructed project will result in mode shift of trips to and from UCD is speculative. The document correctly points out that the timing of the improvements identified for Broadway west of Stockton Boulevard, and for Stockton Boulevard, is not clearly established. This is an especially acute statement given that the Stockton Boulevard plan is not complete, and according to City staff, design options are still being considered.

While the Bicycle Master Plan and Vision Zero Top Five Corridor Study indicate that the City plans to implement these improvements near term, and that the SACOG 2020 MTP/SCS identifies the Stockton Boulevard Mobility Project as occurring between 2026 and 2020, these are just plans that do not guarantee funding will be secured to construct large capital improvement projects during the 2020 LRDP Update planning horizon. The DSEIR states that because of, “these planned improvements to Stockton Boulevard and Broadway would address the potential automobile/bicycle conflicts and complement UCD efforts to increase bicycling as a viable travel option to and from Sacramento Campus, therefore this impact would be less than significant.” To mitigate this impact to a less than significant level based on “plans” there would need to be an identified and guaranteed source of funding to construct the improvements. Numerous times throughout the document, the impacts of COVID are cited. The economic recession caused by COVID puts in doubt the future financial stability of revenue streams that create the capital used to fund such projects. Plans do not guarantee the roadway improvements will occur within the LRDP planning horizon, and therefore the bicycle impacts are not mitigated to a less than significant level.

Furthermore, the analysis fails to account for conflicts that will occur on Broadway east of Stockton Boulevard, although Broadway and 50th Street (which sits east of Stockton) is a primary access point to the campus. UCD has fenced the east portion of campus between V Street and Broadway restricting bicycle and pedestrian access, making the Broadway access point the most direct route for bicyclists and pedestrians travel east or southeast, to or from the UCD campus. Therefore because “implementation of the 2020 LRDP Update will result in an increase in potential for conflicts between automobile and bicycle on these off-campus roadways without dedicated bicycle facilities,” until the impacts on Broadway east of Stockton are analyzed, and mitigation proposed, the bicycle and pedestrian impacts have not been reduced to a less than significant level.

The LRDP-TRA-1 and AS-TRA-1 state that these developments will increase the daily passengers on Sacramento Regional Transit by 300 and 200, respectively. With estimates of an influx of 4,000 – 7,000 employees and students, the number of passengers seems grossly underestimated.

Campus shuttles are a way to fill in a public transportation gap not provided by Sacramento Regional Transit. Campus shuttles from major suburbs of Sacramento, such as Roseville, Folsom, and Elk Grove, will reduce greenhouse gas emissions, reduce vehicle traffic, and reduce need for parking. This follows a similar pattern to many technology companies, who provide shuttles and busses for their employees.

Mitigation Measure LRDP-TRA-1b: This mitigation measure shifts the responsibility to mitigate transit impacts that result from the project from UCD to Sacramento Regional Transit (SacRT) without any financial compensation. This mitigation measure should include UCD compensating SacRT for the staff time necessary to assess transit performance and safety for routes operating within the vicinity of campus every two years of 2020 LRDP Update planning horizon, in collaboration with UCD. If performance routes fail to meet established standards, UCD should financially compensate SacRT to implement transit service and/or facility improvements identified (e.g., adding service capacity, transit only lanes on Broadway and Stockton). This mitigation makes SacRT accountable for the impacts of UCDs project. While UCD is a constitutionally created entity of the State, with full powers of organization and government, and not subject to municipal regulations of surrounding local governments, the constitutional authority does not give UCD the right to burden another agency with responsibility to mitigate the LRDP 2020 impacts on UCDs behalf.

UCD will work with SacRT to evaluate transportation routes, delays, and usage in the 2020-2021 school year. However, due to the impacts of COVID, this will not represent a normal year. Many folks who work in the area, including Downtown Sacramento and UCD, are working or attending classes remotely. The DSEIR states “process should consider the effects of the current COVID-19 pandemic on transit

performance.” However, UCD does not detail how they will consider the effects of COVID on transit. This should be included in the final EIR.

Comment: Impact: LRDP-WQ-1 and AS-WQ-1: Violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or other degradation of surface or groundwater quality

The construction of hardscapes will increase the amount of stormwater with the potential to enter our local waterways. The increase in vehicle traffic, along with other activities, will result in higher concentrations of pollutants, such as polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, corrosion inhibitors, flame retardants, tire wear particles, metals, among others. There are numerous studies in the academic literature on the effect of traffic. The DSEIR states that the adverse effects to water quality are temporary and limited to wet weather runoff. We disagree with this assessment. Urban stormwater can have a variety of pollutants that are often the target of United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and State and Regional Water Quality Control Board regulatory and mitigation measures. There are numerous studies highlighting the effect of stormwater on water quality.

The implementation of stormwater best management practices (BMPs) must consider those factors. UCD should consider an expansion of planned stormwater BMPs and outline the planned use for all stormwater BMPs. The implementation of green infrastructure, including green infrastructure to treat a wide range of pollutants, needs to occur to protect our waterways. Examples of green infrastructure includes permeable pavement, biochar-enhanced biofilters (for example, swales and rain gardens). The inclusion of biochar or other types of black carbon would increase the treatment of hydrophilic compounds, including dissolved metals and fecal indicator bacteria.

Impact LRDP-WQ-2 Substantial decrease of groundwater supplies or substantial interference with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin

The DSEIR reads, “Implementation of bioswales, permeable pavements, and landscaping that promotes infiltration, would allow for infiltration and promote groundwater recharge.” The DSEIR also states that 35.1 acres of landscaped areas are irrigating using both groundwater and potable water supplied by the city, with 22.8 acres irrigated using groundwater. The analysis relies on data compiled in the 2010 LRDP EIR. In the past ten years, the state of groundwater availability and groundwater recharge have been altered by annual record setting temperature increases, and periods of drought, which has negatively impacted the availability of groundwater and in turn groundwater recharge. This EIR cannot conclude that the impact is less than significant without conducting an analysis based on current data.

While the DSEIR outlines the use of drought tolerant landscaping, it does not outline the planned use for pervious pavement or bioswales, although identifies those treatments as having a positive impact. In addition to conducting an analysis based on current data, Mitigation Measures should be included that outline the amount of pervious surface and the number of bioswales to install, to effectively mitigate and support groundwater recharge. In addition, a Mitigation Measure should also be added that outlines the development of a plan and corresponding timeframe for converting the turf currently on campus to drought tolerant landscaping during the 2020 LRDP planning horizon to decrease the use of groundwater supplies.

Impact LRDP-TCR-1 & Impact LRDP-TCR-2: Potential to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource with cultural value to a California Native American tribe and that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)

While the University is not required to take further action under AB 52, the fact that the DSEIR uses AB 52 as justification for not reaching out to, and trying to consult with the tribal government of people’s culturally or traditionally affiliated with the area, is reflective of UCD’s disregard for culture and

communities of color. To place the onus on the people whose cultural resources could be impacted by the project and who may have no knowledge of the project, is acting from a place of power and privilege, rather than acting in a culturally responsible manner. To conclude that “because the university has not received requests from the tribes culturally or traditionally affiliated with the plan area,” and therefore, “the University is not required to take further action under and AB 52,” which results in “no impact,” lays bare the structural racism inherent in AB 52 and UCD benefitting and acting from a place of power and privilege. Although they are not legally required to do so, if UCD wants to operate in a culturally responsible way, these impacts should be considered significant until UCD consults with a tribe to discern if the project poses a potential threat to a tribal cultural resource.

Comment: Mitigation Measures LRDP-AES-1 and AS-AES-3: Install New Landscaping

This mitigation measure must include new landscaping co-benefits, such as the installation of native plant species for pollinators, trees to reduce urban heat island effects, and rain gardens to divert and treat both dry weather and storm water flows. UCD needs to ensure that the irrigation of landscaping minimizes overwatering (i.e., minimizes the watering of hardscapes) and if possible, uses treated wastewater to reduce the burden on the City utilities and the use of groundwater.

AS-UT-1, AS-UT-2: Relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, with the potential to cause significant environmental effects

TPNA disagrees that there are no mitigation actions necessary to decrease this impact. A possible mitigation option for the expansion of utilities at Aggie Square is to use treated wastewater on landscaping areas to reduce demand from the potable water treatment plant. In addition, the DSEIR states that conservation practices will be implemented to help offset the demand. The DSEIR must explicitly outline those conservation practices in the DSEIR to make transparent how they mitigate the impact.

Population and Housing:

The analysis in this section is inadequate and culturally irrelevant. The DSEIR states that per CEQA Guidelines, “an EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project, through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project, to physical changes caused in turn by the economic and social changes.” While TPNA applauds the authors for being responsive to NOP comments, and including a gentrification and displacement discussion, the analysis is incomplete, and wanting in cultural competency/relevancy.

The DSEIR begins to build the causal chain from economic and social changes to physical changes, by presenting “informational” data from the CCSP anti-displacement/gentrification study and analyzing income and poverty, and housing characteristic data. The DSEIR then stops building the causal chain and states, “based on CEQA Guidelines, and its requirements, this Supplemental EIR does not address the effects of the project on the potential for increased gentrification, a change measured under social and economic demographic criteria.” The adherence to CEQA Guidelines in this section is in conflict.

While the document includes a definition for gentrification, the definition has been whitewashed. Gentrification as defined by Merriam Webster is, “a process in which a poor area (as of a city) experiences an influx of middle-class or wealthy people who renovate and rebuild homes and businesses and which often results in an increase in property values and the displacement of earlier, usually poorer residents.” The DSEIR states that, “the CCSP anti-displacement/gentrification study illustrates the kinds of pressures occurring in the area of the Sacramento Campus,” and “it is reasonably foreseeable that an indirect effect of the 2020 LRDP Update could be some level of displacement of existing low-income residents as a result of new investment to meet the demands of employees at the expanded project facilities. The extent of this displacement that is attributable to the project, the locations

of future displacement, and the locations to which displaced residents may move are not known.” While the extent of displacement attributable to the project is not quantified in this DSEIR, the document acknowledges that there will be impact, yet chooses to not define the magnitude of this impact. With an acknowledgment that there “could be some level of impact,” the DSEIR must either quantify the impacts, or concretely refute the gentrification and displacement concerns raised in response to the NOP.

Additionally, combining all income and poverty data for the census block groups within .5 mile from the project into an average, is methodologically incorrect, and culturally irrelevant. The neighborhoods within .5 miles of the project are vastly different in both demographic and economic factors, and therefore will experience gentrification differently. The analysis must account for this difference to quantify the impact, and determine the percent of the population within a .5 mile radius of the project who due to their economic status, have a high probability of being displaced as a result of the project.

LRDP-POP-1 and AS-POP-2: Induce substantial unplanned population growth either directly or indirectly

The DSEIR states that the number of jobs created will not have a significant impact on the population of the Sacramento region. However, the DSEIR needs to reconsider the scale by which they are evaluating this project. While Aggie Square may not have a significant increase on the Sacramento region; the surrounding neighborhoods, such as Tahoe Park (~4,500 residents), will have an increase in the number of residents. The DSEIR estimates a growth in population of about 1,480. If UCD just considers Tahoe Park that would be a population increase of 33%. Although this population may be spread out to other neighborhoods as well, this is a significant impact. This needs to be reflected in the both the assessments and mitigation measures. UCD needs to reevaluate this impact and consider the surrounding area.

This influx of population will have an impact on housing, which is stated in the DSEIR. UCD needs to contribute to a fund toward the construction of affordable housing, to offset the displacement of residents by an influx of people with financial means to pay more for housing.

LRDP-POP-2: Directly displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere

The DSEIR states that no existing housing will be displaced, but indirect impacts need to be considered. The construction of Aggie Square will result in new high paying jobs, which will displace residents who lease and purchase homes in the surrounding areas. UCD needs to ensure that those residents are not indirectly displaced by the construction of Aggie Square. This impact is not less than significant and steps need to be taken to ensure that the community is not indirectly displaced by the new construction. There are a variety of steps that UCD should take to ensure that these residents are not displaced, which includes: (1) paying all who work on the campus, including those who are hired by contractors, a living wage and (2) ensure that a percentage of construction workers are hired from nearby zip codes.

Thank you for considering our comments on the DSEIR. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact the land use committee at tpnalanduse@gmail.com.

Sincerely,

Tahoe Park Neighborhood Association