

ERRATUM TO FINAL EIR UNIVERSITY COMMONS

INTRODUCTION

This Erratum to the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the University Commons project has been prepared to make minor modifications to the text of the Final EIR based upon feedback provided by the Davis Planning Commission at its May 27, 2020 public hearing on the proposed project. The minor modifications included below do not alter the analysis or conclusions contained within the EIR, which remains adequate.

CHANGES TO THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Revision to Comment 43-20

Comment 43-20 is hereby revised, as shown below, to more accurately reflect Commissioner Shandy's comments related to short-term bicycle storage, which were provided during the December 11, 2019 public hearing to accept comments on the University Commons Draft EIR.

As stated in Response to Comment 43-20 of the Final EIR, final design of bike amenities would be determined by the City during review and approval of the final planned development for the project. At such time, the City would ensure that the design of short-term bicycle parking within the project would meet the City's short-term bike parking standards.

- 43-10
Cont'd
- Every 8 years, a jurisdiction is required to make a certain number of residences available, and some percentage must be for low income residents.
 - How would the proposed project influence the achievement of this goal?
- 43-11
- The proposed project is a large, student-oriented housing project. There are thousands of new units coming through the development pipeline. Commenter notes that a rigorous cumulative study should be conducted to assess the impacts of all upcoming large projects within the City of Davis. Such an analysis should focus on the regular CEQA topics of air quality, traffic, water supply, and sewer treatment capacity.
- 43-12
- Commenter believes it is unrealistic to assign one parking space per residential unit.
 - Commenter suggests a more rigorous traffic/parking analysis.
 - Commenter wants to see how the Davis Live parking project works out.
- 43-13
- How will the developer reprimand illicit parking? Current residents have found loopholes in parking regulations. Parking rules must be enforced, especially with an influx of new residents and associated cars.
- 43-14
- Commenter emphasizes that this project is advertised as a commercial project, but it is actually a housing project.
 - Commenter argues that, "it's time to hit the pause button," on large student housing developments within the City given the recent approval of other large projects in the City.
 - Encourages the Council to wait to approve this project until some of the other local student housing projects have been built.

Emily Shandy:

- 43-15
- Commenter is not concerned about the lack of parking availability.
 - Argues that limited parking helps discourage the use of single-passenger motor vehicles.
 - Commenter expresses interest in the Low Parking alternative.
- 43-16
- What is the status of the Russell Corridor Plan? Several mitigation measures are contingent upon this plan.
 - Commenter voices concerns about relying on a speculative future plan that does not currently have funding or a timeline for adoption. The Corridor Plan improvements may not be completed until long after the proposed project is built out and occupied.
- 43-17
- How will the traffic-related mitigation measures be evaluated? Impacts seem to stem from congestion and queuing; how will the mitigation measures' effectiveness be evaluated against these problems?
- 43-18
- Commenter suggests that the project include charging areas for electric bikes and electric vehicles.
- 43-19
- Commenter suggests the inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian circulation throughout the parking areas and project site.
- 43-20
- Page 3-12 of the Draft EIR shows describes an enclosed short-term bicycle storage area (80 spaces) that would cater to long-term storage on the first floor of the parking structure, which will include benches and lockers and would ideally be suited for project employees. The commenter notes that this sounds like the definition of long-term bicycle parking, not short-term. Short-term bicycle parking is intended for people visiting the site and/or businesses, and is to be located in a highly visible and easily accessible area, close to the entrance to these areas. If these 80 spaces are "moved" from short- into long-term bicycle parking, then the project would fall 36 spaces short of the required 291 short-term bike parking spaces. ~~The commenter recommends instead encouraging short-term bike parking~~

~~by placing racks near the entrance of shops and in easily accessible and convenient locations.~~

- Commenter is concerned about the location of the cluster of short-term bicycle spaces at the southeast corner of the site, near Russell Boulevard. This does not meet the definition of bicycle parking for short-term use as laid out in the City' Commenter suggests relocation.

Revision to Comment 10-3

Response to Comment 10-3 is of the Final EIR hereby revised, as shown below, in response to Commissioner Rowe's comments during the May 27, 2020 hearing on the proposed project.

The commenter states an opinion that several side streets of Russell Boulevard, including Oak Avenue, Oeste Drive, and South Campus Way, are currently used to bypass the signalized intersection at the Russell Boulevard/Anderson Road/La Rue Road intersection during peak time periods. The commenter also states an opinion that such side streets were not designed as thoroughfares. Finally, the commenter questions the adequacy of the Draft EIR with respect to analyzing potential project impacts on Oak Avenue, Oeste Drive, and South Campus Way.

Section 4.6, Transportation and Circulation, and Appendix J of the Draft EIR provide a detailed analysis of the anticipated environmental effects of the project on the surrounding transportation system. It is important to note that project-related increases to peak hour traffic volumes on a given roadway do not constitute significant environmental impacts in and of themselves. Instead, Environmental impacts to roadway facilities are identified in instances where the project would exceed the applicable significance thresholds related to vehicle delay and level of service (LOS), or where the proposed project would substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use. Project impacts related to roadway hazards are commonly identified by evaluating if a project would increase traffic volumes or speeds to a level that would be incompatible with the design capacity or speed of a given roadway.

The commenter identifies three Russell Boulevard side streets of concern – Oak Avenue, Oeste Drive, and South Campus Way. Oak Avenue, Oeste Drive, and South Campus Way are components of a larger modified grid network bounded by State Route 113, Covell Boulevard, F Street, and Russell Boulevard that provides multiple route options for motorists traveling to, from, and through Central Davis. Oeste Drive and South Campus Way are both local roads that serve fewer than 75 vehicle trips per hour (two-way volume totals) on the roadway segments north of Russell Boulevard. Oak Avenue is a collector road that serves approximately 200 vehicle trips per hour (two-way volume total) on the roadway segment north of Russell Boulevard. Each of these three roadways currently serve traffic volumes that are well below their respective design capacities. Currently, Oeste Drive has multiple sets of speed humps and Oak Avenue has multiple speed tables to reduce vehicle speeds. According to the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System, on the roadway segments north of Russell Boulevard, the three roadways in question have experienced zero reported injury collisions over the past five years.

Vehicle LOS Impacts

The Draft EIR evaluated potential vehicle LOS impacts at the Russell Boulevard/Oak Avenue intersection (study intersection #7). Therefore, the Draft EIR considers the extent to which project-generated traffic would cause an environmental impact to Oak Avenue on the basis of peak hour vehicle LOS. The Russell Boulevard intersections at Oeste Drive and South Campus Way were not selected as study intersections for the Draft EIR, given that both intersections exhibit modest peak hour side-street volumes that, even with the addition of project-generated traffic, would preclude the intersections from exceeding applicable significance thresholds related to vehicle LOS. In particular, the side-streets would not generate sufficient minor approach volumes to meet the peak hour signal warrant, which is a requirement for a significant impact finding for unsignalized intersections. Moreover, the Draft EIR project trip distribution analysis indicated that Oak Avenue, Oeste Drive, and South Campus Way would not serve a measurable number of project vehicle trips (refer to Figures 10 through 13 of Appendix J of the Draft EIR). Compared to the use of Oak Avenue, Oeste Drive, and South Campus Way numerous alternative routes require less travel time and less travel distance for motorists traveling to and from the project site.

Roadway Hazard Impacts

The Draft EIR describes how the proposed project would cause modest increases in peak hour delay on the Russell Boulevard corridor compared to existing conditions. Therefore, it is conceivable that project increases to peak hour delay on Russell Boulevard could cause some additional diversion of background traffic from Russell Boulevard onto the side-streets that provide alternative routing options, as referenced by the commenter. However, for the following reasons, it is difficult to accurately quantify the extent to which such a diversion would cause a material change in traffic volumes on Oak Avenue, Oeste Drive, and South Campus Way:

- Vehicle traffic most likely to utilize the diversions referenced by the commenter include westbound Russell Boulevard traffic during the PM peak hour. During the PM peak hour, traffic volume data from the Draft EIR indicates that the project would increase westbound Russell Boulevard peak hour traffic volumes approaching Anderson Road from 875 vehicle to 912 vehicles, an increase of 37 vehicles (or four percent) between existing and Existing Plus Project conditions. This represents a nominal increase in PM peak hour vehicle traffic on westbound Russell Boulevard approaching Anderson Road, particularly considering that traffic volumes generally fluctuate as much as 10 percent from day to day.
- As described in the Draft EIR, the project would cause minor increases to PM peak hour delay and LOS at intersections along Russell Boulevard. Along the relevant segment of Russell Boulevard between Anderson Road and A Street, the largest such increase would occur at the Russell Boulevard/Anderson Road/La Rue Road signalized intersection (study intersection #5), where the project would increase average intersection delay from 26 seconds to 32 seconds during the PM peak hour. Despite this increase, LOS C conditions would be maintained, allowing for steady progression of traffic and for most vehicles to pass through the intersection without stopping. Therefore, the project would not qualitatively change the delay experienced by motorists at the Russell Boulevard/Anderson Road/La Rue Road

intersection to the extent where motorists would experience obvious travel time benefits by diverting off of Russell Boulevard onto alternative side-street routes.

- As it relates to the diversion of Russell Boulevard traffic onto side-streets, a variety of factors influence driver behavior and route selection, including trip origin-destination patterns, driver perceptions of delay/travel time, and hourly and daily variations in traffic conditions. Moreover, the existing modified grid network provides a multitude of routing options for Russell Boulevard motorists. For example, in addition to Oak Avenue, South Campus Way, and Oeste Drive, several other north-south roadways provide alternatives to Russell Boulevard motorists desiring to avoid Anderson Road, including Miller Drive, A Street, and B Street. Given these varied factors, there is not a reasonably quantifiable relationship between minor changes to peak hour delay on Russell Boulevard (as would be caused by the project) and use of the side-streets of concern as an alternative to Anderson Road.

Altogether, these factors support the conclusion that project-related increases to traffic volumes on Oak Avenue, Oeste Drive, and South Campus Way, if any, would be low and difficult to quantify with any degree of accuracy. As discussed previously, under existing conditions, each of these three side-streets serve peak hour traffic volumes well below their respective design capacities. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the project would not cause traffic volumes on these three side-streets to exceed their design capacity. Moreover, project-related increases to traffic volumes on these three side-streets, if any, would not be expected to materially change existing traffic speeds. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase hazards on these three side-streets due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use.

~~Therefore, if a relationship exists between peak hour delay on Russell Boulevard and traffic volumes on side streets, the proposed project could cause some additional diversion of traffic from Russell Boulevard onto side streets that provide alternative routing options. However, the extent to which such diversion would occur is difficult to quantify given the variety of factors that influence driver behavior and route selection, particularly given that the project would cause minor increases in peak hour delay on Russell Boulevard compared to existing conditions.~~

Summary

Per the significance thresholds presented in the Draft EIR, an increase in traffic volume on side streets such as Oak Avenue, Oeste Drive, and South Campus Way alone would not constitute a significant environmental impact. The Draft EIR describes project impacts to vehicle LOS at the Russell Boulevard/Oak Avenue intersection but appropriately excludes the Russell Boulevard/Oeste Drive and Russell Boulevard/South Campus Way intersections from the vehicle LOS impact analysis. Finally, the project would not substantially increase hazards on Oak Avenue, Oeste Drive, and South Campus Way due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use. ~~The commenter does not present any data, analyses, or other objective evaluations that would support an assertion that the Draft EIR was deficient in its evaluation of potential transportation system impacts that would be caused by the proposed project.~~ Therefore, changes to the Draft EIR are not required in response to the comment. The commenter's concerns have been forwarded to the decision-makers for their consideration.

Conclusion to Erratum

The above minor modifications to the University Commons Final EIR have been made in response to feedback provided by the Davis Planning Commission at its May 27, 2020 public hearing on the proposed project entitlements. The modifications do not result in changes to the conclusions of the EIR, nor do they affect the adequacy of the environmental analysis.