

Natural Resources Commission Minutes
June 26, 2017

Present: Mark Braly, Anya McCann (Alt), Patrick Henderson, Alan Pryor,
Evan Schmidt, Steven Westhoff

Absent: John Johnston , Michelle Millet

Staff: Mitch Sears, Sustainability Program Manager

Council Liaison: Rochelle Swanson

1. **Approval of Agenda** – Approved unanimously.
2. **Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners, and Liaisons** – none.
3. **Public Communications** – none.
4. **Consent Calendar** –
(A) May 22, 2017 minutes. (6-0; moved by Pryor, seconded by Henderson).
(B) Item pulled from consent by Commissioner Pryor for discussion. Following discussion, on a motion by Pryor, seconded by Henderson, the Commission continued the item to the next Commission meeting (6-0).
5. **Regular Items**
 - A. **Water Conservation Update** – Informational Presentation. City Water Conservation Coordinator Dawn Calciano provided an overview of the City’s water conservation program and results of local conservation efforts. Following the presentation, staff responded to questions. Staff will provide additional detail to the Water Subcommittee on City operations water reductions related to parks irrigation (e.g. result of turf reduction, better sprinklers, etc.?).
 - B. **Integrated Pest Management (IPM) and pesticide use annual report.** City Integrated Pest Management Coordinator, Martin Guerena, presented the IPM annual report detailing the use of pesticides by the City. Following the presentation, staff responded to questions and gave a schedule update on the process for Commission consideration of the draft IPM Policy and Procedure – July.
 - C. **Lincoln 40 Apartments Draft Environmental Impact Report and Project Review** – Staff project Planner Ike Njoku summarized the proposed project, Draft EIR, and Sustainability framework. Commissioner comments related to the proposed project were taken by the City’s EIR consultant, Raney Planning and are attached.

Following discussion, the Commission continued the item to July 24, 2017.
 - D. **Recommendation to Council for Resolution in Support of Climate Action.** Staff will incorporate NRC support for continuing City Council action on GHG emission reductions and support of City participation in responding to the Federal Government’s announcement of the withdrawal from the Paris Climate Agreement into a resolution being considered by the City Council in July.
 - E. **Subcommittee Updates** –
 - Water – Will work on collection of information on water softener use and possible options for reduced use in Davis.
 - Energy – Build it Green has offered to draft a rental energy efficiency ordinance for City consideration. Will update Commission in September.

June 26, 2017

Natural Resources Commission Minutes

- Solid Waste – No report.
- Haz Mat – IPM program draft policy and procedure for Commission consideration in July.
- GHG – No report.

6. Commission and Staff Communications

- a) **Long Range Calendar/Future Agenda Items.** Reviewed
- b) **Upcoming meeting items/events.** Next regular meeting July 24, 2017.

7. Adjourn: 9:00 p.m

**City of Davis
Natural Resources Commission Comments
Monday, June 26th, 2017**

Commission Members in Attendance: Mark Braly, Patrick Henderson, Anya McCann, Alan Pryor, Evan Schmidt, Steven Westhoff

City Staff in Attendance: Mitch Sears, Ike Njoku

Comments Regarding the DEIR

- The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) could have included analysis of LEED Gold.
- The GHG analysis is deficient.
 - GHG analysis should have used net zero as project threshold.
 - Any development resulting in emission of CO₂ would have a significant impact.
- Changes to sustainability plan would affect the DEIR.
 - As such, Sustainability Plan should have been finalized.
- The DEIR provides in-depth analysis of the project.
- Mitigation measures in the DEIR are straightforward and understandable.
- Air quality/GHG may be the biggest issues for this Commission, mitigation for these topics was included in the Air Quality/GHG sections of the DEIR.
- Concern over transportation-related impacts, specifically impacts to intersections along Richards Boulevard, such as Olive Drive intersection, as well as intersection of Richards, First Street and E Street.
- Alternative analysis should include a preferred environmental alternative that results in no impacts.
- Impact of trains and I-80 traffic are considered an impact of environment on the project, and, thus, are not subject to CEQA.
 - However, such impacts were discussed in Appendix D of the Draft EIR
- Presentation of health risks as increased cancer risk is an appropriate approach for long-term health risks.
 - The Commission is also interested to know what sort of other acute or chronic risks there are, for example did the DEIR consider asthma risk?
- Air Quality impacts relate to environmental justice issues concerning placement of transient student housing next to sources of pollution

Comments Regarding Sustainability Plan

- The project should be held to LEED Gold as a standard.
- Completed LEED checklist for LEED Gold should have been provided to the Commission prior to or during the meeting.
- List of options to achieve LEED Gold should have been provided to the Commission prior to or during the meeting.

- Energy Efficiency baseline must be explicitly stated within the Sustainability Plan, stating the baseline for energy efficiency allows for a more meaningful analysis of project's claim to exceed such standards.
- LEED Gold standard does well with handling issues related to building performance and energy use, but the LEED standards do not address transportation-related issues well

Comments Regarding the Project

- Should be built all electric, net zero energy.
- What on-going measures will be implemented to drive down water use and energy consumption?
- How much solar will be incorporated into the project
 - If project will not include enough on-site solar energy production to meet 100% of project demand, then the project should be required to buy community solar for the amount of energy not produced on-site to ensure that the project is 100% solar-powered.
- Dense housing is desirable from a sustainable development perspective
 - There are trade-offs between student-oriented housing on a denser per bed basis and less dense conventional apartment type housing, but in this case density can be positive from an overall sustainable housing perspective.
- Providing housing at this site places transient student population at risk, if housing is affordable here than the project creates an incentive for students to save money short-term, but expose themselves to health risks long-term. This represents an environmental justice issue.
 - How can this project be made a win-win for the City, developer, and student health?
 - Would HEPA filters be included in project?
- The proposed inclusion of bike repair, bike parking, and restricted vehicle parking measures would be effective to reduce transportation demand.
- Limiting parking on a per bed basis is the right approach for this type of housing.
- Limiting parking will encourage less driving, but will the limited parking cause spillover effects such as drivers cruising for spaces or street parking impacts?
- Although many residents of this area use Olive Drive and the arboretum to access campus, a more direct link to downtown is desirable.
- Will Unitrans serve the site, and this portion of Olive Drive specifically?