

Nishi Gateway Sustainability Implementation Plan – Draft Responses to Comments for City Staff Review  
11/25/2015

Source	Comment	Response
<p>Mark Braly, member, Davis Natural Resources Commission, comments on DEIR Nishi and Downtown/University Gateway District</p>	<p>Energy GHG, Objective 3.3: From the outset, design the Nishi development to achieve ZNE such that all site energy use is offset with renewable energy generation on an annual basis. Recommend following edits: <del>To the extent possible, on-site generation will be used to meet this objective; however, off-site generation and purchase of renewable energy offsets will also be considered.</del> Technical appendix C of the Nishi Sustainability Plan shows that additional areas for siting on the project would be enough to provide the needed amount of PV: “If the three additional areas discussed above (and summarized in Table 7 below) are considered for siting PV arrays, and these areas are utilized to the capacities assumed in this analysis, the project can meet zero net energy with on-site production. Total production would be 18% greater than estimated community electricity consumption and would fall just short of meeting 100% of predicted TDV energy consumption.”</p>	<p>The suggested edits are not recommended.</p> <p>As stated in response to comment L3-6 in the Admin Final EIR: “Based on the current land plan for the Nishi site and the competing desires for open space (including trees and other vegetation) and solar (photovoltaic [PV]), the project, at its current stage of planning, cannot reasonably achieve zero-net energy (ZNE) through on-site generation alone. These challenges are identified in Technical Appendix C of the Nishi Sustainability Plan on page 14. Due to the concerns regarding feasibility and effectiveness of additional PV, inclusion of PV within the additional areas identified in the comment may not be possible or yield meaningful renewable energy supplies.”</p> <p>In addition, the purpose of Objective 3.3 is to ensure that the Nishi develop will operate as close to ZNE as possible using on-site renewables; however, it also provides some flexibility to offset energy consumption with off-site sources if needed. The suggested edits to Objective 3.3 would eliminate this flexibility.</p>

Nishi Gateway Sustainability Implementation Plan – Draft Responses to Comments for City Staff Review  
11/25/2015

<p>Mark Braly, member, Davis Natural Resources Commission, comments on DEIR Nishi and Downtown/University Gateway District</p>	<p>Delete the finding that stationary battery and demand response strategies should not be evaluated immediately, but as the project progresses. The reasons given for this finding (current utility rate structures and no methodology for crediting storage of DR strategies with TDV) are not valid. EIR analysis should not rely on utility rates which we know are going to change. The EIR should instead base some of its findings on the possibility that Davis will be served by a community choice aggregation entity.</p>	<p>The suggested edits to the SIP are not recommended.</p> <p>While this comment applies mostly to the EIR, the SIP does reference community choice aggregation (see discussion under “Future Off-Site Energy Strategies” in Chapter 4, and Action 4.23: Off-site Renewable Energy Strategies).</p> <p>The Draft EIR cannot base its analysis on potential changes that have yet to be finalized or approved. CEQA requires an evaluation of the effect of the project on the environment based on existing conditions, including regulatory conditions. Further, the City has yet to approve or form a community choice aggregation entity that could have been taken into consideration as part of the Draft EIR’s analysis.</p>
<p>Mark Braly, member, Davis Natural Resources Commission, comments on DEIR Nishi and Downtown/University Gateway District</p>	<p>Table 4.7-6 Nishi Gateway project should be designed for ZNE on some basis from the beginning. The following Policy Energy 1.3, setting out an interim goal of 30% over Title 24 should be deleted.</p> <p>Recommend following edit: Design and construct high-performance buildings, public lighting, and on-site renewable energy systems that work towards achieving ZNE by Nishi development build-out. Following edit is proposed: Objective 3.1: <del>Achieve high performance buildings at a minimum 30 percent compliance margin relative to the 2013 Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, or equivalent.</del> High-performance buildings will also incorporate energy consumption feedback mechanisms in order to encourage resident and employee engagement and minimize wasted energy use.</p>	<p>The suggested edits are not recommended.</p> <p>Objective 3.1 provides a minimum compliance standard to help ensure that energy efficiency of the proposed high –performance buildings is as high as possible, thereby reducing total required renewables, which is an essential strategy in designing for ZNE. We feel that without including this minimum standard, there is no baseline expectation for minimum efficiency requirements the developer would be expected to achieve.</p> <p>Also, it should be noted that all three Energy objectives stated in the SIP are intended to work together to help the project achieve ZNE, while at the same time maintaining flexibility in how this goal is achieved.</p>

Nishi Gateway Sustainability Implementation Plan – Draft Responses to Comments for City Staff Review  
11/25/2015

<p>Rec and Parks Commission comments (email from Kerry Loux)</p>	<p>Parking should be provided for public use within the project and for access to parks, greenbelt and habitat areas.</p>	<p>Public-use parking is provided on streets (Action 6.22), in public-access surface parking to the south near the open space (see Figure 2-1), and through bike parking (Action 3.5).</p>
<p>Rec and Parks Commission comments (email from Kerry Loux)</p>	<p>Issues of homelessness, especially near freeway and RR boundaries, and at detention basin.</p>	<p>Action 6.39 of the SIP calls for improving safety of the Nishi property by several methods, including providing open space and park design elements that improve the effectiveness of policing and security efforts. This will be implemented through the design guidelines and construction improvement plans.</p>
<p>Rec and Parks Commission comments (email from Kerry Loux)</p>	<p>Density and intensity of development begs for higher park &amp; recreation acreage requirements and park use area design than are currently given in Parks Master Plan.</p>	<p>As stated in Chapter 6, the plans meet and exceed minimum requirements for parks and open space (see Action 6.1, Action 6.9). Open space and parks land uses need to be balanced with other uses for higher-density residential and office/R&amp;D uses, in accordance with the project objectives.</p>
<p>NRC Meeting Comments</p>	<p>Table 1 in Fehr &amp; Peers Technical Appendix is inconsistent with Table 3-1 in Chapter 3.</p>	<p>Chapter 3 was updated after the technical report was completed. In addition, the site plan was updated using information in the technical reports which resulted in changes to the technical information as presented in the SIP.</p>
<p>NRC Meeting Comments</p>	<p>Is ZNE feasible? How would all-electric buildings affect ability to reach targets?</p>	<p>As described in Appendix C (Zero Net Energy Feasibility Study), meeting ZNE goals is feasible with the use of both on- and off-site renewable energy sources (see section 6 Opportunities &amp; Conclusions).</p> <p>With respect to all-electric buildings, the ZNE feasibility study in SIP Appendix C addressed the potential for all-electric buildings on page 5, as follows: “Electrification of a ZNE project is one option but developers and builders are resistant, and implementation is more challenging, for projects with limited site capacity for renewables. Developers and builders are reluctant to design all electric projects because of market limitation concerns. Customers are accustomed to gas, especially for cooking, and the cost to operate electric appliances are still higher than gas.”</p>

Nishi Gateway Sustainability Implementation Plan – Draft Responses to Comments for City Staff Review  
11/25/2015

NRC Meeting Comments	Confirm 30% better than Title 24 is 2013 standard or rolling standard?	<p>Objective 3.1 requires the project to achieve high-performance buildings at a <b>minimum</b> 30 percent compliance margin relative to the 2013 Title 24 energy efficiency standards. This is not a “rolling” compliance margin requirement that would apply to future updates to Title 24 standards.</p> <p>It should be noted that all three Energy objectives stated in the SIP are intended to work together to help the project achieve ZNE, while maintaining flexibility in how this goal is achieved. The “minimum” standard would likely be met or exceeded if future triennial Title 24 code updates push minimum standards beyond an equivalent 30% compliance margin relative to 2013 Title 24 standards.</p>
NRC Meeting Comments	Community Choice Aggregation – how would this affect ZNE goal? May be opportunities to integrate achievement of CCA into Nishi plan? Does Nishi support the case for CCA?	<p>The SIP includes CCA in Action 4.23: Off-site Renewable Energy Strategies. Also, as stated under “Future Off-Site Energy Production Strategies” (SIP, Chapter 4, page 4-19), a communitywide CCA program could be used to offset energy consumption that cannot be directly offset on-site. The Nishi project would not preclude establishment of the CCA, and could help support the case for a CCA program given the Energy objectives set forth for the project. Participation in a CCA program would provide additional opportunities to reduce greenhouse gases for the project as well as for the remainder of the Davis community</p>
NRC Meeting Comments	GHG emission factors for electricity appear to be inconsistent between Nishi and MRIC EIRs.	<p>GHG emission factors and changes to GHG emission calculations will be addressed in text changes in the FEIR, and will also be addressed in edits to SIP Chapter 2, Table 2-2.</p>

Nishi Gateway Sustainability Implementation Plan – Draft Responses to Comments for City Staff Review  
11/25/2015

NRC Meeting Comments	How to reconcile GHG emissions with Council goal of carbon-neutral by 2050? Can any development meet these goals?	<p>As noted in SIP Chapter 2, pages 2-16 and 2-17, ongoing reductions would be needed beyond the estimated buildout horizon year of 2022 to contribute to longer-term GHG emission reduction goals for the city as a whole established by the Davis Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (i.e., carbon-neutrality by the year 2050). Many of these reductions will come from ongoing improvements in vehicle technology and fuel economy standards and other actions that are under State or federal authority. Policy changes and technological advancements are likely to continue, and innovative strategies will continue to emerge that will contribute to further reductions in this project’s (as well as communitywide) emissions, but which cannot be predicted or quantified with certainty at this time.</p> <p>See also the GHG emissions section of the Draft EIR, which analyzed long-term impacts and mitigation measures for GHG emissions beyond project build-out. If the GHG mitigation measures set forth in the Draft EIR are adopted, emissions between 2022 and 2050 will be monitored and reduced according to specified procedures.</p>
NRC Meeting Comments	May need to think about capturing more on-site stormwater and reusing through rainwater harvesting. Don’t just detain and treat with LID measures. Consider capturing site stormwater and storing it for on-site use, e.g. cisterns or other methods, or having nearly all of it percolate, with exception of major storm events.	Stormwater management and LID measures are addressed under section 5.2.3 (Stormwater and Low Impact Development Strategies). Rainwater harvesting and on-site storage was analyzed in SIP Appendix D (Water, Sewer, and Drainage Infrastructure Concepts Study) and was determined to be expensive and not cost-effective based on regional annual rainfall estimates, at least on a large-scale for site-wide irrigation or other non-potable water uses.
NRC Meeting Comments	Need to have purple pipe installed upfront as part of project, including interior (toilet) plumbing; don’t defer until later when it’s too late.	Included as part of Action 5.8: Non-potable Water Distribution
NRC Meeting Comments	Is there an opportunity to bring treated wastewater from the UC Davis WWTP?	This was studied as an option. See Strategy 2 in Appendix D and Action 5.6: Non-potable Water Supply.
NRC Meeting Comments	Potential of non-potable sources (recycled, graywater, well) is good, but would this be enough?	Question unclear. The non-potable sources are addressed in the section under “Non-Potable Water Supply System” in Chapter 5.

Nishi Gateway Sustainability Implementation Plan – Draft Responses to Comments for City Staff Review  
11/25/2015

NRC Meeting Comments	Waste sector: not much in SIP. Need more focus on actions to encourage minimizing waste generation, reduction of solid waste, recycling, composting, etc. Residential & commercial sector programs, coordinate with City efforts. Consider excluding trash compactors, which prevent separation of waste by type. Look at what UC Davis is doing.	<p>This is addressed in Objective 5.5 and section 2.5.3 Waste Reduction and Recycling.</p> <p>The consultant team’s scope of work did not include creating a detailed waste chapter of the SIP. However, we still provided implementing actions in various sections of the plan to highlight waste reduction, reuse and recycling opportunities, where applicable.</p>
NRC Meeting Comments	Consider TDM efforts such as car-sharing or car storage approaches being used on UC Davis campus.	<p>This is addressed in Action 3.25: EV Car Sharing and could also be addressed through the TDM program in response to monitoring results as described in section 3.3.2 Monitoring.</p> <p>Fehr &amp; Peers also considered existing strategies employed by UC Davis when developing the actions related to car-sharing and car storage. The concept of “car storage” is mentioned on page 3-16 of the SIP. See Actions 3.13 through 3.17 relative to parking pricing and management. UC Davis’ efforts should certainly be studied and coordinated more closely as the project and specific parking structures or facilities move into the detailed design and permitting stage.</p>