

Meeting Date:
April 2, 2003

Staff Report

March 25, 2003

TO: City Council

FROM: Bill Emlen, Planning and Building Director
Bob Wolcott, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Internal Housing Needs and City Growth

Preface

Based on the March 12, 2003 discussion, staff understands that Council may be interested in amending the General Plan and Phased Housing Allocation Ordinance to establish a general growth parameter based on internal housing needs. Comments from the Council and public included whether the City should accept the entire housing need identified in the BAE study in response to UCD research park growth and “natural” growth.

Staff recommends a growth parameter of 250 units per year based primarily on acceptance of half (50%) of the research park and natural growth needs identified in the BAE study. The amount is also close to anticipated future fair share housing needs. It is recognized that the General Plan and ordinance amendments will require environmental review and fiscal impact analysis.

The recommended parameter is half the historic rate of growth. An annual average growth parameter of 250 housing units per year with a population increase of 650 per year is slightly over half (55%) of the actual average annual growth during the 22 years of 1980 through 2002 (452 units per year with a population increase of 1,213 per year). The City grew from a population of 36,640 in 1980 to 63,324 in 2002.

The Council cannot expect an exact determination of “internal housing needs”. A determination is affected by numerous development absorption projections, methodological assumptions, and policy decisions about the categories and quantities of needs that the City is willing to accept.

Staff Recommendation

Adopt the resolution provided in Attachment 1 which directs staff to:

1. **Prepare draft amendments** to the growth management section of the General Plan and the Phased Housing Allocation Ordinance for City Council review.
Base the amendments on an annual average growth parameter for the City of 250 total units per year through 2015 to provide for internal housing needs. The parameter shall:
 - a. Include all types of housing, including affordable housing.
 - b. Not include housing provided by UCD on the central campus or in the proposed new neighborhood.
 - c. Combine infill and limited peripheral development. Provide a mix of housing types and prices to meet local employee needs using the information in the “Internal Housing Needs Analysis” as a guide.
 - d. Within the mix of housing, provide emphasis toward for-sale houses affordable to moderate and middle income households and market rate apartments.
 - e. Consider “use it or lose it” provisions in the Phased Housing Allocation Ordinance amendment.
 - f. Consider a mechanism to monitor the uses and intensities in the UCD research park to allow adjustments to housing needs as appropriate.
 - g. Work with City and DJUSD legal counsel to determine means of mitigating school impacts.
 - h. Prepare growth limitation ordinance findings per State Government Code 65863.6 as to the public health, safety, and welfare of the city to be promoted by the adoption of the ordinance which justify limiting the housing opportunities.
2. **Prepare a joint housing strategy**, Memorandum of Understanding, or similar document in cooperation with UCD. Consider as one issue whether UCD should increase the planned student housing to meet the UC system wide planned average of 38% of enrollment.
3. **Determine the appropriate level of environmental review and fiscal impact analysis** as part of the General Plan Amendment, Phased Housing Allocation Ordinance amendment, and development project reviews involving a General Plan Amendment.
4. **Consider this parameter to replace the original parameter of 250 units** (201 for the City and 49 for UCD) passed in a motion by the City Council on September 25, 2002, subject to a study of internal housing needs.

*Alternatives to staff recommended parameter (shown in **bold** below):*

- 175 (164 rounded) Includes 50% of research park and 0% of natural growth
- 200 (196 rounded) Includes 100% of research park and 0% of natural growth
- 200 (212 rounded) Includes 0% of research park and 50% of natural growth
- 225 (221 rounded) Includes 75% of research park and 25% of natural growth
- **250 (245 rounded) Includes 50% of research park and 50% of natural growth**
- 250 (252 rounded) Includes 0% of research park and 75% of natural growth
- 275 (277 rounded) Includes 100% of research park and 50% of natural growth
- 300 (301 rounded) Includes 100% of research park and 100% of natural growth
(BAE study - does not include 28 units to adjust for deficit as described below)
- 325 (329 rounded) Includes 100% of research park and 100% of natural growth

Note: All of the alternatives above add 28 units to adjust for the deficit described in the March 12th, 2003 staff report, except for the 300 alternative (the BAE study) which does not include 28 units to adjust for the deficit.

Why Do This Project?

The study of internal housing needs was prepared to provide a rationale basis for the amount and type of long term housing growth in the City. This was in response to the pressures exhibited by the numerous requests for general plan amendments for housing developments considered by City Council in September and October 2002.

Without a growth management plan, City Council and staff would not know much about the City's future direction nor be able to communicate such direction to citizens or prospective developers. Questions would include:

- How much does the City want to grow and by when? What is the basis for this growth?
- What types of housing are desired?
- Where does the City want to grow within the City and in new areas? How do individual development proposals fit into this framework?

Working Definition of “Internal Housing Needs”

As stated in the BAE study, the term “internal housing needs” is defined generally as:

Internal housing needs are the needs for new housing production that originate from within the community itself, rather than demand for housing that originates from outside of Davis, such as the demand for commuter housing to accommodate workers who are employed in other communities. In addition, internal housing needs include existing unmet needs as well as needs that will arise as the community expands.

The Council cannot expect an exact determination of “internal housing needs”. A determination is affected by numerous development absorption projections, methodological assumptions, and policy decisions about the categories and quantities of needs that the City is willing to accept.

Environmental and Fiscal Impact Analyses

Should Council direct staff to proceed with the general plan and ordinance amendments, staff will determine what level of environmental review and fiscal impact analysis is appropriate.

Staff will explore the feasibility of:

- Combining the environmental review / fiscal impact analysis with major development project reviews, such as the submitted Covell Village applications, to minimize costs for the City. If prepared independently, an environmental impact report or a negative declaration for the amendments could be as high as \$150,000 and a fiscal impact analysis could be as high as \$100,000. These costs should be reduced significantly if combined with another analysis.
- Using the City’s General Plan Update funds to pay for the City’s portion of the environmental / fiscal impact analysis. The sources of these funds are construction taxes (67%) and development impact fees (33%).

Background

October 9, 2003. The City Council appointed a Subcommittee consisting of Council members Ruth Asmundson and Mike Harrington to consider an internally-generated needs study. The full minutes of this meeting are attached to the staff report for the March 12, 2003 Council meeting.

March 12, 2003. The City Council unanimously passed a motion to “receive” an “Internal Housing Needs Analysis” report by Bay Area Economics (BAE). The report was prepared for the Planning Department and the Subcommittee to study internal housing needs. Council continued the discussion of a growth parameter based on internal housing needs to the Council meeting on April 2, 2003.

Additional background is provided in the staff report for the Council meeting on March 12, 2003.

Relevant General Plan Policies

May 2001 General Plan. The following policies from the current May 2001 General Plan are relevant to the discussion of internal housing needs, community growth and related issues. Bold highlights are added by staff. Policies from the 1987 General Plan are also provided at the end for background information only.

Land Use and Growth Management:

- Action LU 1.1d Maintain a growth management system that regulates the timing of **residential growth** in an orderly way considering the following: infrastructure, geographical phasing, **local employment increases**, environmental resources, economic factors, DJUSD school enrollment and sustainability. Such a system shall pursue programs and partnerships which will allow the City to target **residential development to meet identified needs** (e.g., University students and staff, faculty housing, senior housing, housing for low and very low incomes, school district staff, City employees).
- Action LU 1.1e Create and maintain an effective growth management system designed to keep the **population of the City below 64,000 and the number of single-family dwellings below 15,500 in 2010**, which corresponds to a sustained 1.81 percent annually-compounded growth rate from January 1, 1988 to January 1, 2010 and a sustained 1.4331 percent annually-compounded growth rate from January 1, 1996 to January 1, 2010 due to "front loading".
- Action LU 1.1f Closely monitor and **participate in any updates to UCD's LRDP...Consider possible adjustments to the General Plan to address the new LRDP** revision upon determination that a reasonable share of student and faculty growth will occur on campus.

Housing:

- **Goal HOUSING 1. Promote adequate housing opportunities for people of all ages, incomes, lifestyles and types of households.**
- Policy HOUSING 1.5 Work in cooperation with UC Davis to **encourage the provision of housing for UC Davis students.**
- Action HOUSING 1.5b Support the provisions in the Memorandum of Understanding entered into by and between the City of Davis and U.C. Davis in 1989... **rely upon the University to provide on-campus student housing to provide for accelerated enrollment beyond 24,000 students by the year 2000-01 and 26,000 students by the year 2005-06...** Seek an **update of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) including the percentage of student housing** to be provided on campus.

Schools:

- **Goal Y&E 8. Plan for the costs of new school facilities when planning for specific new residential development.**

- Policy Y&E 9.1 It shall be the policy of the City to take all legally permissible steps to ensure the full **mitigation of impacts of new development** on school facilities.
- Action Y&E 9.1c To the extent feasible, **phase development consistent with capacity needs** of existing and new school facilities.
- Action Y&E 9.1d Prior to approving a new residential project, make a **finding as to the project's impact on school facilities and the measures** taken to address the impact.

Implementation / Financing:

- Policy IMP 3.3 Require that the **costs of mitigation and service provision for development projects** be borne by those projects.
- Standard IMP 3.3a Capital improvements, or portions thereof, that **extend services to new users shall be financed by new development.**

1987 General Plan. The following policies from the 1987 General Plan are provided for background information only.

- Guiding policy 2.1B **Provide for growth to meet internal housing needs** of households whose work or study activities are or have been focused in Davis, and to address regional fair-share housing needs. *The Plan provides space for growth associated with UCD growth and population resulting from expansion of businesses and services that are needed to maintain the self-sufficiency of a larger community.*
- Implementing policy 2.1K Regulate the rate of single-family and multi-family residential construction **to achieve orderly growth relative** to the following factors of:
 - Phasing plan of the zoning ordinance; and
 - **Local employment and enrollment increases.**

Bases for the Recommended Parameter of 250 Units Per Year.

The recommended parameter of an annual average of 250 housing units has the following bases:

1. Acceptance of the housing needs identified in the BAE study with the exceptions of:
 - Accept half (50%) of the research park needs
 - Accept half (50%) of the natural growth needs.
 - Addition of 28 units to adjust for the difference in the planning periods of the BAE study and the UCD LRDP.
2. 250 is reasonably close to anticipated future fair share housing needs issued by SACOG. The last fair share housing need consisted of an annual average of approximately 276 units ($1,932 / 7 = 276$). SACOG has indicated some flexibility in working with the plans of different cities in the region.
3. 250 is one percent (1%) of the 25,000 units in the City as of January, 2003.

The rationale for accepting half of the research park and natural growth needs is explained in the staff responses provided in the “*Key Comments and Issues Submitted by the Public*” section later in this report.

Comparison of Need in BAE Study To Other Annual Average Growth Amounts

The following is a comparison of the recommended average annual growth parameter of 275 units per year (after UCD housing construction) to other average annual housing unit amounts:

- **138 units / year.** Average annual amount based on 965 units remaining units to be built from present (2003) to January 1, 2010 under the current General Plan as amended (965 / 7). Approximately 40% of these units are in affordable housing projects.
- **200-220 units / year.** Based on the remaining units to be built from 2003 to 2010 under the current General Plan (138 units per year as described above) plus a moderate infill scenario. Such infill would require general plan amendments and/or rezonings and would include such sites as the Grande school site, Simmons east of cemetery, Oasis / Willowcreek south site, Kelly Point, Aspen Court, Da Vinci Court, Kennedy Place, Willowbank 9 church sites, Mace Ranch affordable site east of Spafford, and Cowell corridor sites. (This infill scenario would not include sites of a more aggressive scenario, such as Wildhorse school site and horse ranch, PG&E service center, Con Agra, Davis Manor infill, etc.)
- **250 units / year.** Approximate 1% growth rate based on housing units in the City as of January, 2002 (.01 x 24,717 units per DOF). The City is estimated to have approximately 25,000 units in January, 2003. This was the original growth parameter selected by Council on September 25, 2002.
- **276 units / year.** Average annual amount based on the SACOG regional fair share housing needs for the period from July 2000 to June 2007 (1,932 / 7). The fair share of 1,932 units consists of 1.47% for very low income, 19.9% for low income, 32.1% for moderate income, and 46.6% for above moderate income.
- **301 units / year.** Internal housing need per BAE study, February, 2003 (3,914 / 13).
- **442 units / year.** Probable buildout of units in General Plan as adopted in December, 1987, for the period from January 1988 to January 2010 (9,726 / 22).
- **452 units / year.** Average number of building permits issued for the period from July 1980 to July 2002 (10,399 / 22).
- **472 units / year.** Average annual number of building permits issued for the period from July 1, 1987 to July 1, 2002 (7,552 / 16).

Population Estimates for Growth Rates

Staff estimates that the City of Davis population for years 2010 and 2015 as follows (not including persons living in housing provided by UCD on the central campus or in the proposed new neighborhood) projecting the recommended growth parameter of 250 units per year. Alternative parameters of 275 and 300 per year are also shown. The current population as of January, 2003 is assumed to be 64,000.

Average Annual Growth Rate	Future Year (On January 1)	Additional Units	Population Estimate (Adding 2.5 persons Per Additional Unit)
250 units / year	2010	1,750 (250 x 7)	68,375
250 units / year	2015	3,000 (250 x 12)	71,500
275 units / year	2010	1,925 (275 x 7)	68,813
275 units / year	2015	3,300 (275 x 12)	72,250
300 units / year	2010	2,100 (300 x 7)	69,250
300 units / year	2015	3,600 (300 x 12)	73,000

Possible Site Locations to Accommodate the Need

In the Council report for March 12, 2003, staff prepared a table titled “Where Might 300 Units Per Year Be Provided?” to illustrate possible site locations for accommodating housing needs. Should Council select a general growth parameter, staff will draft amendments to the General Plan and Phased Housing Allocation Ordinance to direct the desired amount and type of growth toward desired locations.

Key Comments and Issues Submitted by Public

Staff has received comments and issues submitted by members of the public (see Attachment 2). Staff has attempted to summarize the comments (available as of this report) and provide responses in the following section.

1. **Comment:** The “natural growth” category of the BAE study does not address the needs of the workforce of Davis. Not all children born in Davis will work in Davis. Not all workers in Davis want to live in Davis.

Staff response: If Council agrees with the commentators that the internal housing need should be limited to providing for local employees, staff would agree that the need in this “natural growth” category should be excluded because:

- Those persons born in Davis who later work in Davis (percentage not known but could be 5% to 10%) are covered in the analysis by the other categories of housing need such as the UCD employment growth, City office and business park growth, etc.
- Housing would not be needed for those persons who are not employed or commute outside of Davis for employment.

Council may find that “natural growth” includes more than local employees. A variety of situations may occur which are not necessarily addressed by the internal needs study but would be covered if some “natural growth” amount is accepted. Examples are:

- Children of families in Davis that wish to move back to Davis after college and may not work in Davis.
- Elected or appointed officials that may not be employed and whose spouses commute to work outside of Davis.
- Two married Davis employees divorce and create the need for two housing units instead of one.
- Local employment growth related to “home occupations” and home-based businesses will create housing demand beyond that which could be quantified in the study.
- When locally employed residents retire, most will remain in their Davis homes and their jobs will be filled by new workers requiring housing. Although the net job increase is zero, there is an increase in local housing demand.
- As mentioned in the study, natural population growth is a real phenomenon within the state and to the extent that Davis does not plan to accommodate its share of natural population growth, the City will be assuming that other jurisdictions should be willing to make up the difference.
- Elderly individuals or couples may wish to relocate to Davis so that they may live closer to their children who are Davis residents. Unless they are employed locally, the internal housing needs projections make no allowance for new households like this.

In addition, the BAE study does not add housing to address existing housing needs which include:

- Extremely low vacancy rates for rental units.
- Large number of households overpaying for housing.
- Housing to provide for Davis area employees who want to live in Davis (this information could be checked in a survey).

2. **Comment:** Re-sale housing should be considered as part of the housing supply that is available for local employees.

Staff response: The internally-generated housing needs study addresses the need for additional supply of housing to address the increasing demand for housing that results from UCD enrollment growth and local employment growth. Staff and BAE view the existing housing stock re-sales as a relatively constant part of the housing supply in Davis that is

necessary to satisfy existing demand. Unless there is a shift in the tendency of existing local housing to be occupied more by local workers, the existing supply of housing is necessary to satisfy the demand from the existing employment base. When a house is sold in Davis, the seller may not leave Davis, but instead they may be relocating to another home within Davis. In most cases, when a home is placed on the re-sale market the City has no control over whether it is sold to a local employee or not. It is reasonable to assume that the sellers and buyers of existing housing will be relatively the same in terms of whether they work within the Davis area or outside of the Davis area. If the buyers of re-sale houses consist of a higher percentage non Davis workers (that is, persons who commute to Sacramento or the Bay area for work) compared to the existing percentage, then it could be argued that more new houses would be needed to accommodate the needs of local workers.

3. **Comment:** Housing for the UCD research park is UCD's responsibility. Specific uses are not clear.

Staff response: Staff agrees with the commentor that the specific uses and employee densities of the UCD research park uses are not known at this time. The Council may determine, however, that the planned research park uses have been part of the UCD LRDP and the City has some role in providing housing for university land uses in a university-oriented town, similar to how the City provides housing for UCD employees. UCD is not able to provide subsidized housing for research park employees as University sponsored housing is for UCD employees. Research park employees will come from a variety of public, private or public/private entities and UCD expects that these will not be UCD employees. If housing supply is not provided for the research park employee growth, commuting to surrounding communities would be encouraged.

It should be recognized that the BAE analysis does not assume that one housing unit is needed per employee. For every 100 non-UCD employees, only 47.1% are likely to live in Davis, and it is assumed that only one house is provided for every 1.31 local workers, based on the current number of workers per household in Davis. Therefore, the housing need consists of only 36 housing units for 100 employees. If "natural growth" amount identified in the BAE report is eliminated but it is assumed that 100% of student growth and 100% of employment growth is accommodated locally (while holding all other assumptions including 1.3 workers per household), then the resulting annual average housing need is 380 units per year.

Staff believes it is reasonable for the City to accept only half (50%) of the UCD research park need identified in the BAE study because of the uncertainties of the specific uses and employee densities and because this need could be considered half "external" and half "internal."

4. **Comment:** UCD should provide for its own employee and student growth, and at a minimum provide housing for 42% of its student growth per the system wide goal.

Staff response: The BAE study assumed that the UCD “need” for local housing is 90% of student growth, 75% of faculty growth, and 40% of staff growth. As described in the staff report for March 12th Council meeting, UCD currently provides housing for approximately 23% of student enrollment and UC system wide provides housing for 26%. The proposed UCD LRDP would provide housing for 36% of enrollment in 2015-16. The UC system wide planned average is 38% of enrollment and the system wide goal is 42%. Staff recommends that the City encourage UCD to provide for the system wide planned average of 38%.

5. **Comment:** BAE’s conversion of the number of students to a number of housing units by dividing by 2.5 persons per unit causes an inaccuracy and difficulty in monitoring the demand caused by students.

Staff response: The conversion factor to convert student numbers to housing unit equivalents does not cause an inaccuracy or difficulty. The key issue is whether the City believes UCD is providing sufficient housing for student enrollment growth. The study assumes that the “need” is 90% of the increment of student enrollment growth and UCD is providing for all of this assumed “need”.

6. **Comment:** How can we ensure that new housing will be affordable to the “lower end” of the moderate income range we would like to target?

Staff response: As part of implementing a growth management system, the City can do what it legally and practically can to require that preferences be given to local employees. A wide range of housing types is expected, with an emphasis toward moderate priced units, which will provide a wide range of prices through time. It appears that within the range of growth needs that the City may consider as reasonable to accommodate, even the highest estimates of annual housing need are considerably below the more recent historical average housing construction rates. It is likely that when the economy returns to a growth pattern, housing demand will again increase and the reduced level of housing production that is being contemplated will potentially create significant competition among developers to obtain the limited housing construction entitlements that would be available. This situation would be conducive to giving priority to projects that incorporate mechanisms to increase affordability and increase the number of housing units that will be occupied by local workers.

7. **Comment:** Include all types of housing (affordable, moderate, above moderate, UCD housing) when determining a total need.

Staff response: All types of housing are part of the internal housing need. UCD’s needs and proposed construction are considered as part of the total housing need.

8. **Comment:** Maintain other general plan policies such as a compact, small city surrounded by agriculture and open space. Explore infill possibilities such as Grande school site to provide housing for local employees with moderate incomes. Assess social, economic and environmental impacts before amending the general plan for more housing growth. Planning

for significantly more growth encourages a higher fair share assignment in our next SACOG cycle.

Staff response: The concept of slow, gradual growth based on internal housing needs is consistent with General Plan policies. Staff will determine the level of environmental review and fiscal impact analysis is appropriate when general plan and ordinance amendments are processed. Major changes are not expected in future SACOG fair share assignments but SACOG will consider the City's long term plan for housing supply as well as the plans of other cities in the region.

Attachments

1. Resolution Directing Staff to Prepare Amendments to General Plan and Phased Housing Allocation Ordinance.
2. Comments Submitted by Public.
3. Staff Report for City Council Meeting on March 12, 2003. Includes "Internal Housing Needs Analysis" Report, Bay Area Economics, February 19, 2002. (Copies Provided in City Council Packet Only)

o/bwolcott/housing needs 4-2-03 cc report.doc

Attachment 1.
Resolution Directing Staff to Prepare
Amendments to General Plan and Phased
Housing Allocation Ordinance.

Attachment 2.
Comments Submitted by Public.

Attachment 3.
Staff Report For City Council Meeting on
March 12, 2003.
Includes “Internal Housing Needs Analysis” Report,
Bay Area Economics, February 19, 2002.
(Copies Provided in City Council Packet Only)

RESOLUTION NO. _____, SERIES 2003

RESOLUTION BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DAVIS TO DIRECT STAFF TO IMPLEMENT AN ANNUAL CITY GROWTH PARAMETER, PREPARE AMENDMENTS TO THE GENERAL PLAN AND PHASED HOUSING ALLOCATION ORDINANCE, AND PREPARE A JOINT HOUSING STRATEGY WITH UC DAVIS

WHEREAS, the City Council is interested in basing future City growth on internal housing needs; and

WHEREAS, on March 12, 2003 the City Council received an “Internal Housing Needs Analysis” report prepared by the firm of Bay Area Economics; and

WHEREAS, the City and UC Davis should share the responsibility for housing needed due to local growth; and

WHEREAS, diverse housing opportunities, including affordable housing, are needed by local employees;

NOW THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF DAVIS DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

1. The City Council finds that an annual average growth parameter for the City of 250 housing units is appropriate as a basis for future growth management and planning after considering:
 - a. The internal housing needs identified in the “Internal Housing Needs Analysis” report.
 - b. The most recent and likely future fair share housing needs issued by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG).
 - c. This amount equates to a 1% growth rate based on the approximate number of 25,000 units in January, 2003.
2. The City Council hereby directs staff to:
 - a. Prepare draft amendments to the growth management section of the General Plan and the Phased Housing Allocation Ordinance for City Council review.

Base the amendments on an annual average growth parameter for the City of 250 total units per year through 2015 to provide for internal housing needs. The parameter shall:

- (1) Include all types of housing, including affordable housing;

- (2) Not include housing provided by UCD on the central campus or in the proposed new neighborhood;
 - (3) Combine infill and limited peripheral development, provide a mix of housing types and prices to meet local employee needs using the information in the “Internal Housing Needs Analysis” as a guide;
 - (4) Within the mix of housing, provide emphasis toward for-sale houses affordable to moderate and middle income households and market rate apartments;
 - (5) Consider “use or lose it” provisions in the Phased Housing Allocation Ordinance amendment;
 - (6) Consider a mechanism to monitor the uses and intensities in the UCD research park to allow adjustments to housing needs as appropriate.
 - (7) Work with City and DJUSD legal counsel to determine means of mitigating school impacts.
 - (8) Prepare growth limitation ordinance findings per State Government Code 65863.6 as to the public health, safety, and welfare of the city to be promoted by the adoption of the ordinance which justify limiting the housing opportunities.
- b. Prepare a joint housing strategy, Memorandum of Understanding, or similar document in cooperation with UCD. Consider as one issue whether UCD should increase the planned student housing to meet the UC system wide planned average of 38% of enrollment.
- c. Determine the appropriate level of environmental review and fiscal impact analysis as part of the General Plan Amendment, Phased Housing Allocation Ordinance amendment, and development project reviews involving a General Plan Amendment.
- d. Consider this parameter to replace the original parameter of 250 units (201 for the City and 49 for UCD) passed in a motion by the City Council on September 25, 2002, subject to a study of internal housing needs.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of Davis on this 2nd day of April, 2003, by the following votes:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

SUSIE BOYD
Mayor

ATTEST:

BETTE RACKI
City Clerk

O/bwolcott/midtown reso for gpa