

Planning Commission Public Hearing  
 18 May 2005  
 Follow-up questions (revised 6/3/05)

ID	Question	Response
Baker 1	How much of five-minute response time need is outside Covell Village? (75%)	<p>Maps showing the current five-minute response time areas, and those that would result if the fourth fire station were built at the Covell Village site, are included in this packet.</p>
Baker 2	What outside experts have reviewed the plan and what are their comments?	<p>Mike McKeever, Executive Director of SACOG, reviewed the 1,515-unit plan at the request of Mayor Asmundson. This review occurred in December, after release of the Draft EIR. Mr. McKeever's strong response was that this location is appropriate for urban development, but that the proposal was not dense enough and was therefore inconsistent with the Blueprint scenario. His prime recommendation was to increase the density, especially the number of multifamily units, and reduce the number of large lots. Other recommendations included placing open space amenities near the areas of greatest density, increasing the variety of uses within each subarea, and providing multifamily and condominium units instead of areas of small-lot single-family units.</p> <p>Victor Dover, Charter Member of the Congress for the New Urbanism, provided a mail/telephone peer review in March. He reviewed a more-refined 1,864-unit sketch that was presented to the City Council at the end of January. Mr. Dover was generally complimentary about the environmental aspects of the proposal, the alleys, and the distribution of open space. Suggestions that were incorporated into the site plan include the inclusion of the hamlet centers, greater connectivity in the street grid, and refinement of Village Center layout. Suggestions that were not incorporated were greater connectivity to Pole Line Road (such as north of Channel A), minimum lot width of 22½ feet, requirement for detached garages, raised foundations for the houses, and narrowing travel lanes.</p>
Baker 3	What compromises to city standards are necessary to achieve New Urbanist principles, SAGOC guidelines, and need to pay for infrastructure (eg FARs)?	<p>Baseline city standards for single-family lots include 6,000 sf minimum lot size, 60' minimum lot width, and 40% maximum lot coverage. The 40% threshold Floor Area Ratio (FAR) may be exceeded with an administrative design review.</p>

ID	Question	Response
		<p>The purpose of the Planned Development district is to allow deviations from standard to provide sound housing for persons of low, moderate and high income levels, a mix of housing styles and costs, creative approaches in the development of land...</p> <p>Here is an excerpt from the Congress for New Urbanism:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Today, there is no official certification to distinguish between the best New Urbanism and projects that adopt only the name. The quickest way to judge a project is to follow the criteria used by New Urban News in compiling its annual list.</li> <li>• Rule out any project that is gated, that lacks sidewalks, or that have a tree-like street system, rather than a grid network. The project as a whole should connect well with surrounding neighborhoods, developments, or towns, while also protecting regional open space.</li> <li>• Rule out "single-use" projects that are just housing, just retail, or just office. The various types of building should all be seamlessly integrated -- from different types of housing, to workplaces, to stores.</li> <li>• The project should have a neighborhood center within that is an easy and safe walk from all dwellings in the neighborhood. Buildings should be designed to make the street feel safe and inviting, by having front doors, porches, and windows facing the street -- rather than having a streetscape of garage doors.</li> <li>• The project, and particularly the neighborhood center, should include formal civic spaces and squares.</li> <li>• Finally, there is the "popsicle test." An eight-year-old in the neighborhood should be able to bike to a store to buy a popsicle, without having to battle highway-size streets and freeway-speed traffic.</li> </ul> <p>City staff expects to see (and supports) greater density and smaller lot sizes, reduced front setbacks, reduction in "step-in" requirements for</p>

ID	Question	Response
		<p>second stories, and increased lot coverage or FAR for the smaller lot sizes. This is consistent with standards for other small-lot subdivisions approved in Davis, such as Phoenix Place. Discussion of reduced zoning standards needs to be balanced with design standards to evaluate aesthetics, privacy, perimeter and internal fencing, private open space, and other features for quality design. The draft Development Agreement establishes assumptions for some of these parameters. Others should be resolved in the PD zoning process.</p>
Baker 4	Is this an infill site?	<p>The City of Davis General Plan defines infill as development “on vacant or ‘underutilized’ urban-designated land within a city’s boundaries.” By this definition, the Covell Village site is not infill because it is neither designated urban nor within the city limits. However, the location does have several characteristics of infill sites – it is primarily surrounded by urban uses; it is well-served by utilities and transit; and it is nearer the center of Davis than other greenfields sites.</p>
Baker 5	We should encourage the fire station to adhere to the Design Guidelines	<p>Staff concurs. The draft Development Agreement calls for the fire station to incorporate the projects “New Urbanist” theme, being particularly sensitive to the public appearance of the Covell Village frontage. Similar provisions would also be expected in the Planned Development zoning and design regulations.</p>

<b>ID</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Baker 6	What traffic impacts were identified for Wildhorse and Mace Ranch?	<p>The FEIR for Wildhorse identified more dwelling units than assumed in the General Plan, increased demand for governmental services, and air quality impacts. Traffic impacts on Covell and Pole Line would be unavoidable because of the determination to not widen. Signal improvements on Pole Line and Covell would reduce intersection impacts to less-than-significant. Pedestrian and bicycle impacts were cumulatively significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>The East Davis Specific Plan (Mace Ranch) FEIR identified street widening and other improvements that would reduce all intersections to a LOS C or better level. This includes widening Pole Line Road south of Covell to eliminate parking.</p>
Baker 7	Traffic impacts of ConAgra as a business park vs mixed-use development – what’s the difference?	<p>Please see Chapter 1 of the Final EIR and Response to Comment 20-64 of the Final EIR, which states in part:</p> <p>The ConAgra property is discussed in Impact Statement 4.3-2 (pp. 4.3-17 and 4.3-18) and throughout the DEIR. As noted on page 4.3-17, the ConAgra site is currently zoned by the City of Davis as a Planned Development for a mix of light industrial and business park uses.</p> <p>As noted in Chapter 1 of this Final EIR, the traffic consultants for the project (Fehr &amp; Peers), prepared a supplemental traffic analysis as a result of the comments generated on the DEIR. This supplemental analysis considered traffic impacts, which would result from the development of a mixed-use project on the adjacent Con Agra property (See Appendix A to this Final EIR for a copy of the Memo). The analysis determined that more internalization of trips would occur between Covell Village and the ConAgra property with the mixed-use development proposal because the uses are more complementary. The mixed-use development would add fewer AM peak-hour trips but more PM peak-hour trips than the business park to the surrounding roadway system.</p>

<b>ID</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Baker 8	How do we ensure there is no Mello-Roos district?	<p>The City has two types of Mello-Roos districts. The City's existing Citywide Mello-Roos District is in effect for most development approved since the 1987 General Plan (Aspen, Evergreen, Willowcreek,...). In terms of the existing Mello-Roos District, the City has the option of annexing the project area into the existing North Davis Mello-Roos; at this time, however, the proposal would be to exclude the project from the citywide Mello-Roos, thereby leaving existing properties with the burden of amortizing district debt. The result of this plan will be that Covell will pay 100% of the Development Impact Fee burden, whereas projects included in Mello-Roos districts are able to offset the Impact Fee burden by the amount of the Mello-Roos tax.</p> <p>Neither the City nor the developer have any plans to establish a City Mello-Roos specific for this project similar to the one in Mace Ranch; however, the project would be subject existing school district assessments, as well as a proposed new CFD to fund operations of a new school facility (part of DJUSD mitigation agreement).</p>
Baker 9	Are there toxic issues with a shallow-well for irrigation? Would it be legal to use this source for surface irrigation? When do we find out?	<p>Staff is not aware of any toxic issues with using intermediate depth wells such as those in use for the City's drinking water. Irrigation with non-potable water is legal and has been done in California for a number of years, principally with reclaimed treated water. Permitting of the non-potable water use and the system would need to be researched. The only timing implied by Exhibit E of the Development agreement would be in advance of the installation of the irrigation system for the on-site public parks and greenspaces.</p>

<b>ID</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Baker 10	Who pays for the well? Is one well enough?	<p data-bbox="932 280 1902 461">Per the development agreement, the developer would fund the cost of the well, to be reimbursed by impact fees collected by the City from the developer for this purpose. The EIR requires one or more wells, depending upon the production that meets total peak demand. A single well producing 1,500 gallons per minute would be sufficient to serve the project.</p> <p data-bbox="932 461 1850 526">Water savings from alternative irrigation systems have not been calculated.</p>

<b>ID</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Baker 11	Need to talk about Pole Line Road north of Covell	<p>Due to LOS levels anticipated at intersections and segments of Pole Line Road north of Covell Boulevard [2015 + project], the following conditions should be placed on the project no later than at the time of approval of the first Tentative map:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developer shall reserve/dedicate sufficient right of way along Pole Line road to accommodate [east to west, from existing curb and gutter] 15’ bike/parking lane, 11 foot travel lane, 13 foot travel lane, 14 foot median/left turn lane, 13 foot travel lane, 11 foot travel lane, 8 foot bike lane, curb and gutter, and “greenstreet improvements” (40 foot wide minimum) on west side. In the vicinity of Moore Boulevard, and north to the city limits, the total right of way required may be reduced to reflect the absence of on-street parking on the east side of the street.</li> <li>• Additional right of way shall be dedicated, as necessary, for relocation of existing utilities [overhead electrical, etc.].</li> <li>• Additional right of way shall be dedicated/acquired [west side], as necessary, at the expense of the developer, at intersections to accommodate roundabouts (if 2+ lanes are constructed), or auxiliary lanes for signalized intersections, if necessary (for 4-lane option).</li> </ul> <p>Developer should construct and/or secure the cost of full improvements (reconstruction of old “County” street section, widening to four plus lanes, greenstreet improvements, traffic signals [less portion of signal costs for Moore Boulevard Signal, previously secured]) at the time(s) deemed appropriate when the Tentative Map(s) are approved. If the “full improvements” are not constructed (i.e., if two-lane improvements with roundabouts at the intersections are chosen), the remaining deposit is to be used for city-wide traffic safety/traffic calming improvements needed to alleviate project impacts.</p>

ID	Question	Response		
Baker 11	How many building permits were issued in 2003 and 2004?	Year	Single-family	Multifamily
		2000	395	171
		2001	147	50
		2002	107	200
		2003	62	203
		2004	72	63
Baker 12	<p>Would the proposed PV generate only 5% of subdivision's energy needs? Should we have a higher goal such as 25%?</p>	<p>Staff has not seen energy generation numbers for the development. We believe that it is true that on average, single family residential PV installations tend to be in the 2.5 kW to 4.0 kW range instead of the 1kW minimum in the development agreement. It is also true that it is not economical to oversize your PV installation and in some cases 2.5 kW would be too large.</p> <p>The applicant has provided an estimate that the proposed system would provide 30% of the electrical needs of a "standard" house. The cited authority also notes that since these homes will be more efficient than a "standard" house, the percentage would be higher.</p>		
Baker 13	<p>Agricultural mitigation needs to be as shown on the map. Are fees permitted? When will the mitigation be secured?</p>	<p>Section 40A.03.050, <i>Eligible lands</i>, of the Davis Municipal Code, states that following in pertinent part:</p> <p>(a)The agricultural mitigation land shall be located within the Davis planning area as shown in the Davis general plan. The criteria for preferred locations or zones for agricultural mitigation land shall be determined by the Davis city council after receiving input from the advisory committee, Yolo and Solano counties, Woodland, Dixon, the Davis open space committee, the natural resources commission and Yolo and Solano farm bureaus [...]</p> <p>The agricultural lands required per Mitigation Measure 4.2-1 of the EIR would be provided north of the project site, which is within the Davis Planning Area. Although Mitigation Measure 4.2-1 does not specify the exact location where the agricultural land would be set aside, the mitigation measure is adequate to address the requirements of the Davis Ordinance.</p>		

ID	Question	Response
		<p>Furthermore, in regards to payment of fees, Section 40A.03.030 of the Davis Ordinance states:</p> <p>(2)In lieu of conserving land as provided above, agricultural mitigation may be satisfied by the payment of a fee based upon a two to one replacement for a farmland conservation easement or farmland deed restriction established by the city council by resolution or through an enforceable agreement with the developer. The in lieu fee option must be approved by the city council. The fee shall be equal to or greater than the value of a previous farmland conservation transaction in the planning area plus the estimated cost of legal, appraisal and other costs, including staff time, to acquire property for agricultural mitigation. The in lieu fee, paid to the city, shall be used for farmland mitigation purposes, with priority given to lands with prime agricultural soils and habitat value.</p> <p>Although the payment of a fee in-lieu of conserving land is an option per the Davis Ordinance, the applicant has indicated that agricultural land would be preserved north of the project site. The majority of the mitigation lands are specifically identified and the remainder would be in a city-targeted area. This is a requirement of the Development Agreement.</p>
Baker 14	What is the real percentage of affordable units?	<p>The 1,864-unit project includes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>144 L/M for-sale units</li> <li>170 unit capacity in land dedication sites</li> <li>74 unit-equivalent low-income apartments</li> <li>400 middle-income units (300 in City-approved income tiers)</li> </ul> <p>Low/mod housing is 388 units, 20.8 percent of the total  Middle income (all 400) is 21.5 percent of the total  Market apartments (205 units) would likely meet moderate-income affordability levels but are not restricted or regulated.</p>

ID	Question	Response
Baker 15	Do surrounding areas (Wildhorse, Northstar) have the same flood plain issues? What is the function of the drainage ponds in addressing the flood plain issues?	<p>Wildhorse had no identified Zone A issues, except in the then-existing Channel A. Wildhorse and Covell Park Northstar were both designed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accommodate upstream 100-year [1% chance] flows through/around the project.</li> <li>• Detain increment of 100-year event incremental increase due to development.</li> <li>• Store historical 100-year storage on-site (no displacement of historical storage)</li> <li>• Provide building pads above the 100-year ‘base flood elevation’ (BFE).</li> </ul> <p>Covell Village is proposed to do likewise, except some of the required storage may be located “off-site”. This would be ‘hydraulically equivalent’ and would mitigate the effects of increased drainage flows and volumes due to development.</p> <p>The primary function of the drainage ponds is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detain additional 100-year flows due to development (i.e. to not increase downstream peak runoff)</li> <li>• Store storm water volumes that historically were stored on the site (i.e. to not increase downstream peak runoff)</li> <li>• Provide dirt needed to raise future building pads above the FEMA BFE.</li> </ul> <p>Auxiliary functions of the ponds include, but are not necessarily limited to, habitat &amp; passive/active recreation purposes.</p>

<b>ID</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Baker 16	What are SACOG growth requirements and how would Covell Village affect them?	<p>SACOG established a “fair-share” obligation of 1,962 units for the most recent term of January 2002 through July 2007. The City has demonstrated that it has sufficient land with residential zoning to accommodate the required number of units.</p> <p>The next Regional Housing Need allocation is projected to cover the 5½-year period beginning July 2007. At this time, we do not know what housing needs will be assigned to SACOG by the state, or what needs will be assigned to Davis by SACOG. It is also possible that the regional housing needs process will be delayed or revised by state legislation, as has happened in previous years. SACOG staff is unable to project the process and results of the next allocation cycle.</p> <p>If Covell Village is approved as proposed, and construction begins in 2007, the project would provide approximately 1,500 allocated and unallocated units toward meeting a 2007-2013 fair-share obligation.</p>
Whittier 1	Why is there no wastewater treatment on site with effluent for irrigation?	<p>A description of the general challenges of using reclaimed water for irrigation purposes can be found in Appendix J of the DEIR, in the document included titled “Project Information for Notice of EIR Preparation, Davis Well Capacity Replacement by Winzler and Kelly Consulting Engineers. Page 22 of that document discusses Non-Potable Irrigation Systems.</p>
Whittier 2	What is the exact location of Savannah Corridor?	<p>All maps show a dotted line for 200’ wide “savannah.” There is approximately 200’ offset between the Wildhorse buffer and “savannah” corridor as shown. The applicant has provided a dimensioned overlay on an aerial photograph, attached.</p>
Whittier 3	Are senior homes exempt from the transit assessment district? They already ride the bus for free	<p>Seniors over 60 years of age ride free on Unitrans with a pass issued by the City Senior Center. The applicant has stated that senior would eligible to apply for an exemption from the assessment district requirements. The Memorandum of Understanding with Unitrans does not explicitly address senior housing.</p>

<b>ID</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Whittier 4	Why is there no parking for the church?	<p>The development standards for the Village Center uses, including parking standards, have not been resolved, but the applicant anticipates that there will be shared parking for the non-residential uses, allowing a more efficient utilization of parking areas when uses have differing times of intensity. A preliminary parking breakdown is attached.</p>
Whittier 5	What is the age limit for senior-only housing?	<p>The applicant proposes a minimum age of 55 years, Second units, if built, would be rentable to non-seniors.</p>
DuPree 1	Are there no cisterns for stormwater retention?	<p>Experience with the Wildhorse development agreement efforts to use greywater at individual residences indicated the difficulty of doing a large scale application of non-potable water for residential irrigation. Harvesting rain water has some challenges and opportunities not addressed in that experiment but has not been seen to date as being able to reduce a large enough fraction of water demand to pursue further.</p>
DuPree 2	Is there vinyl chloride?	<p>Please see Response to Comment 20-27 and 20-65 of the Final EIR, which notes that vinyl chloride has not been detected on the project site. The following represents the majority of the Response to Comment 20-27:</p> <p>According to both the City of Davis Public Works Department and GEOCON Consultants, the statement on page 11-5 of the 1997 Jones &amp; Stokes Covell Center EIR is incorrect, because vinyl chloride has not been detected in either groundwater or vapor samples collected from the monitoring wells located on the Covell Village property.</p> <p>As further stated by GEOCON Consultants in March 2005, review of the source document referenced in the 1997 EIR (Evaluation Monitoring Report and Proposed Corrective Action Plan, Old Davis Landfill prepared by Dames &amp; Moore, dated June 1997) does not corroborate the statement that vinyl chloride was detected on the Covell Village property. Vinyl chloride was detected in well DM-MW3 located on the City-owned landfill property during the initial groundwater sampling events performed in March and July 1992 at concentrations of 2.0 and 2.7 ppb, respectively. Subsequent sampling performed by the City's consultant (Dames &amp; Moore) between September 1992 and August 1996,</p>

ID	Question	Response
		<p>including five cone penetrometer test (CPT) groundwater samples collected from the Covell Village property, did not indicate detectable levels of vinyl chloride. Biannual groundwater sampling performed by the City of Davis since 1999 has only resulted in one detection of vinyl chloride; 2.8 ppb in well DM-MW2 located on northern portion of the City-owned landfill property in February 2001. The lack of persistent detections suggests that vinyl chloride is not present in groundwater beneath the former landfill or adjacent Covell Village property as a stable migrating plume. Groundwater sampling performed by both the City and the City's consultant Dames &amp; Moore indicate similar sporadic trace levels of vinyl chloride and other volatile organic compound slightly above analytical laboratory reporting limits.</p>
DuPree 3	Should housing be this close to landfill?	<p>Please see Response to Comment 27-128 of the Final EIR. The response states in part that:</p> <p>As stated in the Site Boundary Issues section of the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) Advisory #51 dated July 22, 1998, "Any property located outside the parcel containing the solid waste is not subject to the postclosure land use requirements of 27 CCR 21190, even if the outside property is within 1,000 feet of the waste footprint (27 CCR 21190(c))."</p> <p>In addition to not being subject to postclosure land use requirements of the California Code of Regulations (Title 27), groundwater and methane gas impacts have not been detected on-site from the adjacent landfill (See Responses to Comments 20-27 and 27-128 of the FEIR for a discussion of groundwater and methane gas, respectively)</p>

ID	Question	Response
DuPree 4	Is hotel problematic for downtown? Does it create unusual impacts on project?	<p>Economic Development staff does not support including the hotel in the Village Center. For Covell Village, the benefits of the hotel (increased support for neighborhood retail and increased vibrancy of the Village Center) would be provided by an equal number of residential units. It should be noted that the hotel is anticipated to generate fewer vehicular trips than residential uses: 2.52 trips/day per hotel room, compared to 5.96 trips/day for apartments. Hotel peak hour trips are slightly higher than apartments, however.</p> <p>The applicant has noted that the CV hotel might serve visitors to the hospice and to Sutter-Davis hospital. Staff notes that the downtown hotels are not much farther to the hospital, and much closer to UC Davis, south and east Davis business parks, and other local destinations.</p> <p><i>See also response to Patterson 6, below</i></p>
DuPree 5	What assumptions and provisions were made for bicycle use? What impact will bicycle commuters have on the overall system?	<p>The site plan review determined that the proposed bicycle facilities will provide adequate onsite circulation, access to onsite buildings and parks, and connectivity to existing bicycle facilities in the surrounding area. The project provides off-street grade-separated path connections to existing facilities to the south, east and west. In addition, on-street (Class II) bicycle lanes are provided within the project site with connections to existing Class II facilities off-site, such as on Pole Line Road, Covell Boulevard, and L Street. Therefore, bicycle commuters will have a comprehensive system of bicycle-designated facilities, which will minimize their impact on overall roadway operations. The presence of bicycles generally only affects right-turning vehicles at intersections; in that vehicles have to yield to or weave with bicyclists.</p>

ID	Question	Response
DuPree 6	Can we differentiate between regional and local need for housing?	<p>Since 2002, when the Council was confronted with numerous peripheral and infill development proposals, the Council has been interested in basing city residential growth on internal housing needs. These needs would include local employment growth, natural growth, and UC Davis student, faculty and staff growth after factoring in housing planned by the university. The internal housing needs study by Bay Area Economics concluded that the average annual internal housing needs of the City, after subtracting housing planned by the university, is greater than 300 units per year. The Council carefully considered the study, its assumptions, and the community's slow growth goals and has recently directed staff to implement an average annual growth parameter of 1% or about 260 units per year to year 2010. Exempted units include affordable housing units and the actual growth may be greater than 300 units per year in the future.</p> <p>Determination of whether a development proposal meets local needs is also related to the anticipated type and price of housing. Affordable and middle income units are two categories that have not been served by the market, particularly in new construction.</p> <p>The Council has not been interested in basing city growth on the regional market demands of persons who do not work here, such as those who might want to live in the city and commute to their workplace outside of the Davis area.</p>
DuPree 7	Should we accept seven LOS "F" intersections?	<p>The DEIR identified that 7 intersections would operate at LOS F for the High Density Alternative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pole Line Road/Picasso Avenue (AM and PM)</li> <li>Pole Line Road/Donner Avenue (AM and PM)</li> <li>Pole Line Road/Moore Boulevard (AM and PM)</li> <li>Covell Boulevard/L Street (AM and PM)</li> </ul>

ID	Question	Response
		<p data-bbox="1031 282 1675 386">Covell Boulevard/Pole Line Road (PM peak hour) Covell Boulevard/Alhambra Drive (AM and PM) Mace Boulevard/Second Street (AM peak hour)</p> <p data-bbox="934 428 1915 605">Although these intersections would operate at LOS F with the addition of traffic from the High Density Alternative, the DEIR identifies mitigation measures for the 7 intersections, which would reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level. Impacts from the proposed project would be less than those of the High Density Alternative.</p> <p data-bbox="934 649 1915 716">Furthermore, in reference to LOS F roadway segment operations, a few things should be kept in mind:</p> <ul data-bbox="982 724 1915 1089" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="982 724 1915 790">• The roadway segment analysis uses a simple volume-to-capacity ratio to determine the service level;</li> <li data-bbox="982 799 1915 938">• The daily roadway capacities are theoretical and conservative and assume a typical volume distribution throughout the day (i.e., typical peaking characteristics). Therefore a LOS F designation does not mean that the road will operate at LOS F all day;</li> <li data-bbox="982 946 1915 1089">• When peak period congestion occurs, drivers are likely to: (1) shift their travel time to a little before or a little after the peak (a phenomenon called peak hour spreading), (2) choose not to travel if the trip is discretionary, or (3) combine the trip with another trip.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="934 1133 1808 1198">The occurrence of items 1 and 2 above would result in lower volumes (and better operations) than reported.</p>

<b>ID</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
DuPree 8	How has crime been addressed?	<p>Responses to Dr. Fowler’s crime questions were addressed to a limited extent in the Final EIR (See page 4-57, Response to Comment 20-11). The Police Department concurs that higher populations are associated with higher numbers of crimes, if not crime rates. There are likely other – stronger – factors including sentencing guidelines, community involvement, and demographics. These factors are often outside the control of local jurisdictions.</p> <p>Specific components of the Covell Village proposal that address crime issues include city funding for additional police officers; security cameras in the Pole Line, Covell, and Anderson/RR bicycle undercrossings; and expected “New Urbanist” design principles that foster neighborhood communication and “eyes on the street.”</p>
DuPree 9	Are we moving toward surface water? What are our SB610 and 221 obligations?	<p>The City of Davis together with UCD and the City of Woodland continue to move forward with an application for Sacramento River water. The project is best described in the Joint Water Supply Feasibility Study done for the City and UCD by West Yost and Associates in 2002.</p> <p>The Covell Village project required an SB 610, Water Supply Assessment. The Water Supply Assessment was completed by the city and is included in Appendix J of the DEIR. SB 221 would be applicable at the subdivision map stage. While not identical, the requirements of the assessments are largely the same.</p>

ID	Question	Response
DuPree 10	What are the impacts of the letter from Yolo County?	<p>The County has forwarded a letter to the City outlining its position relative to process for negotiation of a tax-sharing agreement for annexation of the Covell Village project. At this point, the City and the County are engaged in discussions related to assessing fiscal impacts on both the City and the County – which will serve as the basis for a tax-sharing agreement. The City has responded to the County’s concern that the City’s fiscal analysis ignores any impacts to the County and still assumes the current Master Tax-Sharing agreement. An additional issue raised by the County is their desire for the fiscal elements of the draft development agreement to be considered as part of the tax-sharing negotiations. The City believes that this request is without precedent and is still hopeful that an agreement will be reached with the County on allocation of property-tax revenues which ensures that neither jurisdiction is “harmmed” if the project is approved and moves forward.</p>
Patterson 1	Why are hamlet centers not on the General Plan map or in the project description?	<p>The hamlet centers are not on the General Plan map, in part because there is no specific designation for these small clusters of urban services. The General Plan allows up to three acres of non-residential development within a residentially-designated area. The hamlet centers should be identified and defined within Preliminary Planned Development, and shown on the PD zoning map.</p>
Patterson 2	What happened to senior core facility? Is that land available for medium density housing?	<p>The label for the senior core facility was inadvertently omitted from the latest site plan. A corrected site plan is attached. This is also indicated in Table 1-1 of the Final EIR and therefore trips associated with the senior core facility were assumed in the traffic calculations for the “1,864” Alternative.</p>

<b>ID</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Patterson 3	Is agricultural mitigation land the same quality of soils? This detail is not in the Development Agreement.	<p>The soil is of higher quality on the Covell Village site. On average the soil quality on the agricultural mitigation lands is lower than the project site according to the LESA analysis conducted by the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service. However, due to separation from residential and other sensitive uses, the mitigation site is rated of roughly equal agricultural value.</p> <p>If, however, home sites are allowed in the agricultural mitigation area as proposed the separation from sensitive uses advantage would be reduced. A current example is the North Davis Meadows II subdivision near the Davis Golf Course. Several residents in that neighborhood have made requests of the farmer and the City that have increased management costs for the City and generally made the farmer less interested in farming the property (“Don’t need the headache”).</p>
Patterson 4	Are homesites “next to” or “near” the road?	<p>Current thought in local land conservation circles is to locate new rural home sites as close to existing roads as possible to reduce impacts on agricultural practices and not disrupt irrigation systems and other agricultural infrastructure.</p> <p>The applicant notes that none of the one to two acre sites would be included in the total mitigation easement lands. Two options are outlined, one is to place no more than one site per existing legal county parcel. The other option is to cluster all 5 sites together along the north edge of the Meyer parcel. They would front an access road for the organic farm which would be added on its north edge. The homes would buffer the organic farm from conventional farming to the north. Clustering would be the better environmental option, but will require the cooperation of the County.</p>

<b>ID</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Patterson 5	What analysis has been done of the intersection north of Moore on Pole Line Road? Will it have a roundabout or signal?	<p>The intersection of Pole Line Road/Covell Village Road was analyzed in the Draft EIR as a side-street stop-controlled intersection (i.e., Pole Line Road traffic does not stop). Project impacts were not found at this location; therefore, no mitigation is required. The project applicant is not proposing a roundabout at this intersection; therefore, the Draft EIR does not analyze a roundabout.</p>
Patterson 6	Should the restriction to an extended-stay hotel be in the Development Agreement or the Measure J baseline? Should there be a phasing requirement for the hotel?	<p>Should the hotel be permitted, staff suggests the use be subject to a CUP requirement and a market study to determine that there is a need for the hotel and that it will not jeopardize downtown hotels. The phasing requirement should be based upon the results of the market study and not a specific year of buildout. Zoning restrictions could be added to require suite-style rooms with kitchenettes, access to laundry facilities, voicemail and computer/Fax data port or wireless computer connections in each room, a business/conference center, access to food and exercise facilities, and possibly a 24-hour per day on-site supervisor.</p> <p>The applicant notes that if the project begins in 2007, the infrastructure for the Village is slated for completion in the third phase of construction or about 2010. Thus, a hotel or inn is not likely to open until approximately 2011. By that time, approximately 500 homes should have been completed. Hospice and Co-housing infrastructure are slated for phase two.</p>
Patterson 7	Should the Village Center be phased?	<p>Staff does not recommend phasing provisions for the Village Center. To the extent that the community-serving retail addresses existing unmet needs, it should be encouraged to occur as quickly as possible.</p>
Patterson 8	Are off-site improvements mitigating the flood plain, or will houses also need to be elevated?	<p>See response to Baker 15. Note that it is proposed that the building pads will be 'elevated' to above the BFE. The houses/structures are proposed to be built on the 'elevated' pads.</p>

<b>ID</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Patterson 9	Is the 90-acre drainage pond in addition to other flood mitigation? Is it on agricultural mitigation land? Can it be farmed?	<p>The various alternatives evaluated in the Mead &amp; Hunt Master Drainage Plan for Covell village, including the concept of the 90 Acre drainage pond (Alternative A), achieve the primary goals/functions outlined above. An exhibit showing the general location and configuration of the pond is in binder tab 14.</p> <p>According to the preliminary report from House Ag Consultants, the pond can be farmed but at a generally reduced value due to diminished soil quality and limits on what can be grown given the primary function as a drainage facility. A local example is the Yolo Bypass. The proposal does not provide specifics on whether the area dedicated to the slope of the edges of the basin, which have little if any farm value, would be included in the land given credit for agricultural mitigation.</p> <p>The DA states that pond location will not be credited as agricultural mitigation land if the Yolo County Ag Commissioner determines that there is a “significant loss” in the value of the land for agricultural purposes.</p>
Patterson 10	Does the City need the well now? Why are we rushing?	<p>The City has limited capacity to add new residential development without an additional well. Constructing the well may take as much as three years, and it is the City’s expectation that the water supply will be secured as the first phase of the subdivision is completed.</p>
Patterson 11	Has Unitrans blessed the transit funding concept?	<p>The applicant has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with Unitrans.</p>

ID	Question	Response
Patterson 12	Why aren't we looking at a LLAD for maintenance of green areas?	<p>The City has not considered a project-specific LLAD for Covell Village for several reasons. First, the City has abandoned the historical model for funding park maintenance that resulted in different "districts" paying amounts in proportion to "benefits" received. Instead what evolved into a consistent citywide LLAD has now been partially replaced by the Parks Parcel Tax. The fiscal analysis shows that project revenues can be expected to cover anticipated costs of park maintenance within existing tax structures (Parks Tax and General Fund). The City has not considered a return to special assessment districts for provision of park maintenance activities. In addition to project revenues sufficient to cover maintenance costs, the developer is proposing a contribution of \$2.1 million toward maintenance activities. Finally, the project is not considered to have a level of parks maintenance services/assets that is materially different from the citywide standards to warrant a review of project-specific funding mechanisms.</p>
Ochoa 1	What will be the cost to expand the WWTP when we reach maximum?	<p>This cost has not been determined as the city has no current plans to expand capacity.</p>

<b>ID</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Ochoa 2	What does \$500,000 in traffic calming achieve?	<p>Draft development Agreement provides that "... Developer to provide \$500,000 to City to be used for traffic calming and noise attenuation... for J and L Streets, Claremont Drive and other streets.... Neighborhood residents will be involved in the determination of the traffic calming locations and measures." It is anticipated that the money would be used toward the construction/maintenance of traffic calming measures which may be determined to be necessary/desirable by the City with the involvement of residents of the affected streets. These may include, but are not necessarily limited to, undulations, traffic circles, and/or medians. It cannot be known whether the \$500,000 would fully fund all of the improvements that may be subsequently needed/desired. A portion of the funds would appear to be available for sound/noise reduction measures, which may include traffic calming measures, and/or improvements, including but not necessarily limited to, street maintenance overlays using 'rubberized asphalt concrete' to reduce "road noise".</p> <p>The Public Works Department estimates that traffic calming improvements range from \$6,000 to \$20,000 per location. This includes public involvement, design, and construction.</p>
Ochoa 3	Should fiscal impacts be analyzed for "fair share" or is that the minimum standard?	<p>For purposes of the fiscal analysis, "fair share" is defined as "current service standards." This is consistent with the approach taken in past and current fiscal analyses of significant development projects. To the extent that any given project has the potential to generate revenues that exceed the "current service" cost requirements, the City gains additional flexibility with which to address additional service-delivery needs.</p>

ID	Question	Response									
Robertson 1	What is median price of units?	<p>The calculations in the fiscal analysis assumed</p> <table data-bbox="932 321 1831 425"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>Mean</u></th> <th><u>Median</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Single Family Housing (Ownership)</td> <td>\$ 530,743</td> <td>\$ 475,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Senior Ownership</td> <td>\$ 447,660</td> <td>\$ 425,000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Planning staff estimated a median price of the ownership units using the estimated values in the fiscal analysis, with additional value for the “habitat” lots to reflect the increase FAR requested by the applicant. The applicant did not provide additional information on this topic.</p> <p>Housing prices are generally calculated based upon the square footage of the structure. A 4,500 square foot lot with a 1,500 square foot house might be worth \$487,500, assuming a value of \$325 per square foot. The same lot with a 3,000 square foot house might be worth twice as much. The applicant is requesting significant increases in lot coverage from City standard, and no restriction on Floor Area Ratio. Both these provisions would have the likely effect of increasing home size and value. Lots in desirable locations, such as near the habitat, are proposed to have the highest lot coverage allowances.</p>		<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>	Single Family Housing (Ownership)	\$ 530,743	\$ 475,000	Senior Ownership	\$ 447,660	\$ 425,000
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>									
Single Family Housing (Ownership)	\$ 530,743	\$ 475,000									
Senior Ownership	\$ 447,660	\$ 425,000									
Robertson 2	Staff to return with support for overriding environmental impacts	Included in draft resolution certifying EIR.									

<b>ID</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Robertson 3	Why this project and why now?	<p>Staff continues to conclude that this is the location for additional greenfields development when and if the City decides to approve such growth.</p> <p>The City Council has approved a growth parameter of approximately one percent per year. There is not sufficient infill capacity in the City to meet this objective without significant changes in development standards, economic development priorities, and environmental thresholds.</p> <p>The southern portion of this site was envisioned for urban development in the 1987 General Plan. It was removed in 2001, in part due to concerns over “front-loading” of residential development. Approval by the voters in November, if granted, would allow development of the site within the tail end of the existing General Plan term and well into the term of the next General Plan.</p>
Robertson 4	Are these the appropriate Baseline Project Features? Should applicant have drafted them?	<p>Because Measure J is new, the community does not have an established practice in determining what components should be included in the baseline project features. If the Planned Development zoning were available for adoption at this time, staff would likely recommend a briefer – and more objective – inventory of baseline project features. For Covell Village, the PPD is not ready for adoption. Components such as the alley configuration, the “hamlet centers,” and the New Urbanist vision are not included on the General Plan map and are only imprecisely defined in the EIR project description. Staff believes that having more description in the baseline project features is necessary in this instance to provide assurance to the voters that the described project, if approved, is consistent with what would eventually be built.</p> <p>The applicant’s alternative enumeration of Baseline features is included as an attachment to the staff report.</p>

<b>ID</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Robertson 5	Is a penalty or fee an option or a loophole for the agricultural mitigation?	<p>Generally, in-lieu fees have not been effective in securing mitigation – the proposed agricultural mitigation ordinance amendments address this issue.</p> <p>The Development Agreement provides that if developer fails to provide the agricultural mitigation, they are responsible for additional costs of securing the easements as required by the Development Agreement. It is not specific whether this means the same easements or other easement lands, and whether eminent domain is envisioned as a possibility.</p>
Robertson 6	How sensitive is WWTP capacity to the 2.39 persons/hh assumption? Is it fair for this project to consume all remaining capacity so next development would have entire expansion cost?	<p>The change in population per dwelling unit (DU) at build out of Covell Village is about 600 fewer people. If the old assumption of 4.0 persons/DU were used it wouldn't significantly impact the plant. The estimate of 7.0 mgd at the plant in 2010 without Covell Village, used in the DEIR, is very conservative. Connection charges for existing projects within an approved General Plan are consistently applied and therefore fair. Future changes to the general plan, if they require additional capacity at treatment plant, will increase the connection charges. The issue of future capacity of the treatment plant is currently being addressed as part of the wastewater treatment plant master planning efforts.</p>
Robertson 7	Record should show how project analyses are consistent with requirements of SB610 and 221	<p>This is addressed in the findings for Certification of the EIR and action on the applications, attached to the staff report.</p>

<b>ID</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Robertson 8	If hotel were removed, what would be the effect on fiscal and traffic?	<p>The current fiscal analysis does not reflect any “incremental” revenues related to the proposed hotel development. As such, there would not be any significant impact should the hotel be removed from the project. Replacing the hotel with Multi-family housing has not been fully analyzed; however, multi-family housing developments tend generate negative fiscal impacts as they typically require more service-based costs than they generate revenues....based on the analysis performed on the original 1515 unit proposal last January, “break-even” for housing units was approximately \$250,000 - \$350,000, which is on the high-end of “market rate” assessed value for multi-family housing units.</p> <p>The hotel is anticipated to generate fewer vehicular trips than residential uses: 2.52 trips/day per hotel room, compared to 5.96 trips/day for apartments. Hotel peak hour trips are slightly higher than apartments, however.</p> <p>Conversion of the hotel to equivalent multi-family would increase the impacts to the treatment plant. The increase would not be significant from a treatment plant standpoint. See Robertson 6.</p> <p>Additional residential units would lead to additional obligations for affordable housing and parkland dedication, consistent with City ordinances.</p>
Robertson 9	Is development adjacent to the landfill problematic?	Please see Response to Dupree 3 above.
Saylor @ CC	Do we have existing LOS F intersections in Davis?	The 2001 GP DEIR identified “Existing” LOS F for Richards segments and the Richards/1st intersection. This was prior to the installation of the free right turn lane and improved signal timing.

ID	Question	Response
Robertson @ CC	Should fire station be mitigation measure for five-minute response time?	Although this would be an allowable approach under CEQA, staff is not proposing it because the Development Agreement is anticipated to be adopted at the same time.
Souza @ CC	Why no FAR standard?	As noted in Baker 3 above, some deviations from City standard are anticipated to further the goals of efficient use of land and a New Urbanist development.
Hayes @ PC	CD copy unreadable letter	The letter from Dr. Hayes is legible in both the print and on-line versions of the Final EIR. His poorly scanned copy may have come from a source other than the City.
Spencer @ PC	Agricultural mitigation, “may” vs “shall”	Staff believes that the “may” in the fourth bullet of the agricultural mitigation exhibit is in error. It has been changed to “shall” in the version included in this packet.
Whittier email 1	Will there be (or has there been) soil samples taken to various depths and various locations throughout the area that will have housing or public areas in the region of Covell Village?	Please see Responses to Comments 20-27 and 28-1 of the Final EIR. Four groundwater monitoring wells (HLA-MW1, 2, and 3; and DM-MW-4) are located on the Covell Village project site. HLA-MW1, HLA-MW 2, and DM-MW-4 are used to monitor the possible groundwater effects from the Davis Landfill (see below discussion for Davis Landfill). Biannual groundwater sampling performed by the City of Davis since 1999 has only resulted in one detection of vinyl chloride; 2.8 ppb in well DM-MW2 located on northern portion of the City-owned landfill property in February 2001. The lack of persistent detections suggests that vinyl chloride is not present in groundwater beneath the former landfill or adjacent Covell Village property as a stable migrating plume.
Whittier email 2	Have we taken water samples from the underground aquifers, near surface and farther down?	