

From: Doby Fleeman <doby@outlook.com>

Sent: Wednesday, January 8, 2020 3:57 PM

To: herman.boschken@sjsu.edu <herman.boschken@sjsu.edu>; Cheryl Essex <cheryl.essex.davis@gmail.com>; robertsondl@sbcglobal.net <robertsondl@sbcglobal.net>

Subject: Re: Item 07B - AMTRAK Study - Commission Review - January 8th Meeting

Dear Commissioners:

With apologies, I still don't have the complete email distribution list for all Commission members - please feel free to share this email with your fellow members and staff.

I am hoping to make public comment this evening. If not then at least you have a record of my concerns as a local, Downtown property and business owner:

"Commissioners, and Members of the Downtown Plan and Amtrak Stakeholders Advisory Committees,

Short Version:

As a longtime Downtown property and business owner, I'm not clear on the purpose of the current Access and Connection Study. The study appears to focus primarily on existing uses by local Davis residents – when my concerns as a Downtown property owner/developer and employer are focused on transit solutions addressing the dual needs of current and future visitors, residents and employees to the Downtown. Likewise, my concerns very much include enhanced linkage and transit solutions between the station and our primary employer at UC Davis and hopefully new employment centers like Aggie Research Center.

Point being, virtually all of these ridership profiles would involve people living outside the city seeking alternative and less impacted transit solutions for both inbound ridership for out-of-town residents and outbound ridership for Downtown in-town resident dwellers (a class which presently doesn't exist but is supposedly a key goals within the Downtown plan).

When might we expect the accompanying studies and recommendations to begin grappling with these ridership issues and dynamics and a corresponding timetable with clear, prioritized implementation and funding priorities?"

Extended Comments:

If memory serves, it was in 2016 that the Davis Futures Forum first began presentations focusing on the nexus between Downtown rail transit improvements and the resurgence of missing middle housing and redevelopment. Examples included Pleasant Hill Transit Village, Dan Zack's presentation on the redevelopment of Downtown Redwood City, and the role of the SMART rail initiative for Downtown Petaluma.

After this series, I had come to believe there existed an essential linkage between these dual themes of robust, reliable public transit the accompanying redevelopment potential for the surrounding Downtown district.

As the DPAC process has unfolded, I have waited – somewhat impatiently - for a clear synopsis and plan addressing how the committee ranks the importance of an enhanced Davis Station as a cornerstone for the transformation of Davis Downtown. To date I have seen precious little which explicitly attempts to link the future Downtown redevelopment with community re-investment in Davis Station as the multi-modal transit hub serving the Davis and UC Davis community.

Virtually every chapter in the DPAC plan has elements focusing on the twin goals of increasing economic activity, reinvestment and vitality in the Downtown - while simultaneously increasing local pedestrian and bicycle modalities as the dominant form of “Downtown access” while automobile transit is systematically replaced.

What am I missing? How does one simultaneously increase Downtown residence densities, Downtown retail and entertainment driven visitor trips, and Downtown office employment without an explicit and parallel plan to accommodate the accompanying, external transit demand?

As the result, I keep looking for that final list of key recommendations and investment priorities to help make this transition a reality. Where are the drawings, where are the schematics, where is the discussion, and what is the timetable for proposed new transit corridors to whisk ever more visitors to the Downtown, UC Davis and beyond?

Personally, I see Davis Station sitting at the nexus of that solution – but what I don’t yet see is a synchronizing between the plan’s ambitions and the current list of executable priorities in the section titled Implementation.

By the same token, I’m not clear on the purpose of the current Access and Connection Study. The study appears to focus primarily on existing uses by local Davis residents – when my concerns as a Downtown property owner/developer and employer are focused on transit solutions addressing the dual needs of current and future visitors, residents and employees to the Downtown. Likewise, my concerns very much include enhanced linkage and transit solutions between the station and our primary employer at UC Davis and hopefully new employment centers like Aggie Research Center.

Point being, virtually all of these ridership profiles would involve people living outside the city seeking alternative and less impacted transit solutions for both inbound ridership for out-of-town residents and outbound ridership for Downtown in-town resident dwellers (a class which presently doesn’t exist but is supposedly a key goals within the Downtown plan).

When might we expect the accompanying studies and recommendations to begin grappling with these ridership issues and dynamics and a corresponding timetable with clear, prioritized implementation and funding priorities?"

Respectfully,

Doby Fleeman

From: Doby Fleeman <doby@outlook.com>

Sent: Wednesday, December 4, 2019 3:44 PM

To: herman.boschken@sjsu.edu <herman.boschken@sjsu.edu>; Cheryl Essex <cheryl.essex.davis@gmail.com>; robertsondl@sbcglobal.net <robertsondl@sbcglobal.net>

Subject: DPAC Commission Review - December 4th Meeting

Dear Commissioners:

With apologies, I don't have the complete email distribution list for all Commission members.

Cheryl has heard my repeated public comments before the DPAC committee over the past two years.

The thrust of these comments reflect my continuing concerns with the prospects and plans for implementation of the plan as currently written. As a Downtown business owner, property owner, commercial landlord and potential developer, I have questions about what steps are being taken to record and address the legitimate concerns of this group of stakeholders with respect implementation of vital infrastructure improvements necessary to support future transportation, circulation and parking needs as we look to increase the level of economic activity in the Downtown core.

The plan is nothing if not a vision based upon increasing densification of development and uses in the core of the Downtown. If I understand the plan correctly, it envisions significant increase in residential dwelling units, commercial office space to support increasing employment, and increased retail, service, and entertainment businesses catering to increasing volumes of tourism.

Perhaps I have overlooked it somewhere, but the stages outlined in the implementation plan (Chapter 8) really don't seem to include comprehensive discussion of new investments to support alternative new modes of transportation - other than ridehailing, bicycle and pedestrian modes.

Rather the priority implementation recommendations appear to focus more on amenities and placemaking investments - the most significant of which would be Davis Square - a project which would actually remove critical, existing parking supply.

Missing, it appears, are any explicit recommendations associated with:

- 1) Planning/Increasing ridership volume via Amtrak Station
- 2) Planning/Increasing public transit investment - bus and rail - and ridership for existing Downtown employees and "would be" new Downtown residents, visitors and employees.
- 3) Planning/Investment in new Downtown or remote parking supply
- 4) Planning/Investment in new Electric Shuttle Service between new remote lots and Downtown
- 5) Planning/Investment in new, dedicated shuttle service between UCD campus and Downtown Amtrak Station.
- 5) Planning/Investment in new Municipal Downtown Entertain, Music or Community Center

To date, it seems that all we have to go on is what's been drawn and proposed - and none of these elements appear to have been considered either as foundational or critical elements for the successful implementation of this redevelopment vision.

My questions:

- A) Is one possible without the other?
- B) Should the Plan be amended to include more attention to the role and timing of these issues?

Respectfully,

Doby Fleeman