



Meeting Minutes

City of Davis

Downtown Davis Plan Advisory Committee Meeting

Senior Center Activity Room, 646 A Street

Thursday, June 14, 2018

7:00 P.M.

Committee Members: Meg Arnold (Chair), Judy Corbett, Josh Chapman, Chris Granger, Larry Guenther, John Meyer, Sinisa Novakovic, Eric Roe, Deema Tamimi, Randy Yackzan

Liaison Members: Ryan Dodge, (Eric Dulcich sitting in for Ryan dodge) Matt Dulcich, Cheryl Essex, Justin Goss, Rob Hofmann

Absent: Michelle Byars (Vice Chair), Catherine Brinkley, Mary DeWall, Darren McCaffrey, Rob White

City Staff: Bob Wolcott, Diane Parro, Heidi Tschudin

Consultants: Mitali Ganguly (Opticos Design), Katie Durham (AIM), Matt Kowta (BAE Urban Economics)

Please note: The numerical order of items on this agenda is for convenience of reference; items may be taken out of order. Times shown are approximate and may vary.

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

- a. The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

- a. The agenda was approved by consensus.

3. Approval of Minutes

- a. The minutes were approved by consensus.

4. Brief Announcements from Chair, Committee Members, Staff or Consultants

City staff briefly provided information related to Information on Opportunity Zones in California.

- a. Diane Parro: I was asked to speak about the opportunity zone topic regarding the map sent to you by Bob that shows what the opportunity zone is for Davis. There is more unknown about this program than is known, but it is a federal designation,

so it was launched by the federal government. The federal designations were allowed to be made in each state, so it was our governor picked the census tract zones that were designated; the number one goal is to increase private investment in areas of poverty. There is a lot of information available that was sent to you about what the investment looks like and how an individual investor would access that kind of information. There's not a lot of information on what the investments can be invested in, but it seems like it is going to be extremely broad. The mechanism for tapping into that has not been announced yet, so we will track that. The role of the city is to help inform people who are investors or potential investors, we will not actually have a role to play in facilitating.

b. DPAC Comments:

- i.** John Meyer: Is Nishi in the City limits?
 - ii.** Diane Parro: No. With the plan it will be annexed.
 - iii.** Chris Granger: Was the City asked to make any recommendations to the State on the opportunity zone?
 - iv.** Diane Parro: We did comment during the brief comment period. We made justification for the census tracts, there were five that had appeared on a long list, so from that five we chose two and gave justification for those two.
 - v.** John Meyer: Is that more than one census tract?
 - vi.** Diane Parro: One census tract. If you have specific questions, you can always email me. There is a lot of unknown about the situation, but we would like to get the word out to everyone in the City of Davis and try and get the investors to pay attention to us.
 - vii.** John Meyer: How much of the zone is going to be consumed by Nishi?
 - viii.** Diane Parro: A small part – if you look at the map provided you will see which part of it is Nishi.
 - ix.** Meg Arnold: I did a little bit of research on the opportunity zone, and I would be happy to share my synthesis of the research I did on this topic.
- c.** Diane Parro: In the collection of the information in preparation for the meetings and surveys, which are actually a collection tool for information to provide you with an advance, the question came up whether or not the City could guarantee that your answers would be anonymous, including if there was a public records request, would your IP addresses need to be given? We can definitively tell you that everything you provide us in the context of preparing for this meeting is the property of the City and can be turned over in a public records request; we cannot guarantee that you are anonymous.
- d.** Bob Wolcott: I'd like to ask Katie Durham from AIM to describe a virtual workshop that was launched today, giving us one more opportunity for the public to weigh in on some of the key issues.
- e.** Katie Duram: It is appropriate for the DPAC members to take the questionnaires as citizens of Davis. We just launched the online virtual workshop. If anyone missed the first participatory design workshop, this is a great opportunity for them to provide feedback. Isabelle sent a Dropbox link this afternoon with the link and some promotional materials that you can share on social media. We designed the virtual workshop so that participants can choose to take the questionnaire all at

once, which takes about 21 minutes, or they can take it by chapter, split up by different topics.

- f. Chris Ganger: How long will it stay open?
- g. Katie Durham: Two weeks, June 14 – June 28.
- h. Chris Granger: Can we have the link to the video and flyer sent to us from the City's social media? It is easier for us to share the information through quick links from something that is already posted.
- i. Katie Durham: Yes, I will make a note of that and send the link on Friday.
- j. Bob Wolcott: I hope everyone stops by 3rd street between A and B, it's quite fun to see a public works construction project in the right-of-way happening, it's supposed to be finished by mid-November.
- k. John Meyer: I just have one more quick agenda question – when we were asked to talk amongst ourselves and in our groups, will we be talking about that tonight?
- l. Meg Arnold: Yes, that is item 6.
- m. Deema Tamimi: If we have written comments, should we submit them?
- n. Meg Arnold: John submitted written comments ahead of time, so we all have copies of them, but I think since you've got them but not all of us have a copy, you can just provide a verbal summary of the notes and send them following the meeting.

5. **Presentation by BAE of Economic Analysis**

Matt Kowta of BAE Urban Economics presented the Economic Analysis, an addendum to the Downtown Davis Existing Conditions analysis. Preliminary Findings were presented on April 19, 2018.

a. DPAC Comments:

- i. Larry Guenther: (*Referring to commuters and expenditures*) Is that office workers statistic for Downtown Davis, or is it national?
- ii. Matt Kowta: This is a national average from a national survey.
- iii. Chris Granger: Is our per capita – not comparable to students – is that higher than the national or California average?
- iv. Matt Kowta: There is a lot embedded in that – you have a lot of expenditures, and then the question of where are those expenditures made? In California, state-wide, you have an \$11,300 per capita average, in Davis alone we have about \$9,000 per capita average. I'd say we have some relatively high-income family households balanced out by the relatively low spending of the students, and then the constraints on how much retail we have in town where you can make expenditures – a lot of people go out of town to purchase. We are not going to capture necessarily all potential spending. This isn't exactly how it all breaks down, but I think we have some challenges to get to a larger number because we do have a large student population and out-commuting, so we shouldn't necessarily expect that we will be able to support this amount of retail per capita.
- v. Chris Granger: On page 8 in your report, you show all these people leaving, but half of those people that are leaving are going to University. You mentioned that you would be able to give us more detail about the University retail sales, so we will be able to see how much of that annual office/worker spending is just happening over at the university rather than in town.

- vi.** Matt Kowta: We won't necessarily be able to say that that's all office/worker spending, but we will be able to see if there is a certain amount that otherwise might happen here, in the City itself.
- vii.** Mitali Ganguly: One clarification, Matt, the Davis average that you have – is that just Davis residents, or does that include the student population?
- viii.** Matt Kowta: It's the resident population in Davis, including whatever students are counted as residents.
- ix.** Eric Roe: What office size is most in demand Downtown right now?
- x.** Matt Kowta: What we see is that there are more smaller spaces, the "sweet spot" is in the 1,000-3,000 sq. foot range. As I mentioned the increase in the health professional business license type in Downtown, often those are just a single person who just needs a single-office suite. That's what seems to be the main stay of Downtown. Once you get over 3,000 square feet, there are not too many options.
- xi.** Eric Roe: Where did the 5,000 new housing units number come from? That seems high.
- xii.** Matt Kowta: That is the SACOG projection for the City of Davis through 2040.
- xiii.** Randy Yackzan: Does that include multi-family and single family?
- xiv.** Matt Kowta: Yes, but we are primarily focused on the multi-family, but this holds true to single-families as well.
- xv.** Larry Guenther: Does the development you are referring to contain for-sale properties?
- xvi.** Matt Kowta: It's a development that would be for-sale residential units.
- xvii.** Randy Yackzan: What is the density on these?
- xviii.** Matt Kowta: I can't calculate the exact density for you on the fly, but for example, your 12,000 square foot is about a quarter of an acre for the lot. If you have 50 rental units on that lot, you're looking at almost 200 DU per acre. A 33 unit property is about 150 DU. These would all be 4 stories or less. There are no numbers on running the feasibility for 6+ stories – if you go higher than 4 stories, the feasibility issues are more challenging because you jump up to a more expensive construction type.
- xix.** Meg Arnold: In this case it's less about the underlying land costs, and it's more about the build-cost.
- xx.** Larry Guenther: If that's the case, then why is the land so expensive – if you can't redevelop the land why is it worth so much?
- xxi.** Matt Kowta: This is partially because you have owner/users who are willing to pay a certain price and for those people if the price makes sense, so that's the price that everybody, more or less, has to pay.
- xxii.** Chris Granger: None of the scenarios included residential / commercial / retail units.
- xxiii.** Matt Kowta: No, they did not.
- xxiv.** Matt Dulcich: These modeling efforts are assuming a developer is buying a property to own, there could be scenarios where an investor assembled these parcels years ago and is now living off rental checks instead of redeveloping – would that be different for that owner?

- xxv.** Matt Kowta: In some ways yes and no – that longtime owner that has a low basis in the land, is getting checks and cashing them and it’s probably great – they probably don’t have a mortgage on the property. For them to do a redevelopment, they’re going to need to get substantially more leasable/saleable space to make it worthwhile to redevelop. It’s like the mentality of developers coming in to buy property – for example, this parcel has a lot of value, and its \$1 million to buy this lot, so I need to get a lot of development on that site to justify that purchase price – or if it’s a 1500 square-foot house there now, I can’t just build 1500 square-feet and rent it – there needs to be more to it. If there was an owner who had a property that was at the end of its useful life and looked for the opportunity to maximize it, they will be motivated to get the most density out of it.
- xxvi.** Deema Tamimi: From what you showed with 4 stories, it looked like nothing was feasible except for specific owner scenarios but going up to 6 is also not feasible because of the cost under current market conditions. Looking at mixed use, is there any way to find a feasible option or is it just not feasible?
- xxvii.** Matt Kowta: These are unique situations, you must find an owner who is ready to sell, that could potentially happen. The office scenario is getting close to yielding a return that might get an investor to come in, especially if they had a very credit-worthy tenant who would substantially lower their risk, maybe they had a long-term lease, they are going to be able to accept a lower rate of return if the risk on the project is lower – that’s a potential opportunity. We also need to look at public/private partnership opportunities – how can the City work with developers and property owners to help make projects feasible that otherwise would not be feasible. That may include things to reduces costs and risks which may help to convince developers to take more projects.
- xxviii.** Eric Roe: What has Davis or other cities done to help this?
- xxix.** Matt Kowta: Its very common to use publicly owned land, and some of the concepts that Opticos developed anticipated something like that happening and contributing publicly owned land to the project. There have been situations where cities have agreed to be the lead tenant in a building and that credit-worthy long-term lease would help get the financing for the rest of the project. In the days of redevelopment there were opportunities from the state that can provide some potential funding for on-site improvements of off-site infrastructure. It’s no easy task, but I think that publicly owned land is one of the major assets that can be put into these kinds of projects into motion.
- xxx.** Chris Granger: One item that came up in my small group, was a discussion about USDA, which has been one of our anchor tenants, and a lot for people that are leaving our community are working for the state government and the state government has an interest of having more people work from home or working closer to their homes – there may be some opportunities for government anchor-tenants that we should be looking at.

- xxxii.** Matt Kowta: We saw that happen in Elk Grove – there were a lot of employees commuting into downtown, so they put office space in the Elk Grove Community with that same idea. We need to see where the potential for housing is for the workforce.
 - xxxiii.** Larry Guenther: We don't need to look for housing, they have it.
 - xxxiii.** Randy Yackzan: This is an example for what happened to 5th and G Street, 20 years ago the USDA was a major tenant for 60-70,000 square feet. The City helped assemble the land, and we were all partners; it was very challenging, and it went from impossible to challenging to getting it done, that's what you need.
 - xxxiv.** Larry Guenther: Your assumptions were based on square footage, but the slide had units – is the issue that the units are all in square feet?
 - xxxv.** Matt Kowta: In the development program that Opticos created, they calculated out what size of units you could do and achieve those kinds of 4-story apartment unit counts – we had about 800-900 square foot average. The owner's units were more of an average of 1,200 square feet.
 - xxxvi.** Justin Goss: The low rate of return for the no-parking small residential seems counterintuitive – can you talk through what's driving those low rates for return?
 - xxxvii.** Matt Kowta: It's the low-unit count relative to the high upfront land purchase cost. If you're paying roughly \$1 million for the lot and you only get eight units, you're looking at over \$100,000 to build those units just for the land cost. When you go up to 12 units, you get 50% more units on the same land purchase cost which improves the return a little bit.
 - xxxviii.** Justin Goss: In the long form analysis, you walked through the list of assumed costs – so it seems there are a few significant costs other than the land just being valuable. In the summary you talk about public/private partnerships – which of those non-land costs levers would a public /private partnership be created around?
 - xxxix.** Matt Kowta: A public/private partnership that involved land that someone could build on without having to pay a large cost, would be a significant boost to that project. Since you have costs adding on to the land cost, taking the land cost out of the equation could potentially have a significant impact on the overall cost.
- b. Public Comment**
- i.** Doby Fleeman: On the subject of what triggers prevailing wage requirements for the project, it seems like a sensitive issue with the public/private partnerships – it changes the construction costs quite a bit.
 - ii.** Matt Kowta: You will see a lot of public/private partnership projects looking to see if there are off-site improvements that the public dollars can address so they are not actually in the project itself, triggering that prevailing wage.
 - iii.** Kathy Forkas: It seems like the owner-occupied 33-unit model would be an ideal model for downtown. So many things in the pipeline are rental properties where we are not going to get a lot of money from the City, compared to units that might turn-over when the property taxes rise with the time – is that correct?

- iv. Matt Kowta: Rental properties tend to be held in ownership for a longer period time, so they don't get that increase as much as you do for individual for-sale properties. The 33-unit number is at the lower level, and talking about condominiums, you get diseconomies of scale if you have smaller number of units in a condo project.
- v. Kathy Forkas: These don't include low-income housing correct?
- vi. Matt Kowta: Correct, we did not assume there was an affordable component, these are all market rate, admittedly relatively expensive. If you add in the affordable unit, in a 33-unit building, you would be looking at another \$210,000 having a significant impact on knocking the return down by 1.8 percentage points below what would be feasible. Increasing costs can bring a project down to where it seems unfeasible.

6. **Discussion of Outcomes of Participatory Design Workshop #1 on April 24 – 28, 2018**

- a. The committee discussed questions related to key concepts that resulted from the Participatory Design Workshop.
 - i. Meg Arnold: To recall, we established short-term working groups based on the composition of the DPAC and for the purpose of bringing specific perspectives to bear on the ideas that came out of the charrette. We grouped ourselves under broad headings of Neighbors, Downtown Businesses, Users/Residents, and a group of Planners and Liaisons. I would like to ask one person from each group to give a quick summary of your perspectives and answer any questions from others in the DPAC about your group. We will start with John Meyer since he submitted material ahead of time in writing.
- b. DPAC Comments:
 - i. John Meyer: **Neighbors Group:** A couple of points this memo reflect (referring to the printed materials) – the neighborhoods are hugely positive, more energized, more residential. Increased vitality helps. What we are suggesting is how do you give all parties certainty? So, developers aren't creating a proposal that they're taking all these risks on, how do you give developers certainty, how do you give neighbors certainty on what is to be expected – especially in a transition place? We want to make sure that each party doesn't get framed as the stereotype, how do we position ourselves to strive towards successful projects? How do you give an investor/developer expectation about what's possible, and what's administratively possible without running through the hoop? How do you give neighbors a safe expectation that if I am downsizing my family and moving Downtown, that when I look across the street there is something of transition? Most of the concern is the transition zones. Everyone wants flexibility to allow downtown neighborhoods to invest in the downtown properties. Allow flexibility for additions, for second units, character to broadly define the neighborhoods but also making sure that it promotes investment. How do we keep design guidelines and have some certainty? We pose the question to the group and to ourselves of is it a good thing or a bad thing to have the neighborhoods in the actual plan? Do you have more control of the design with new zoning? Or is it best to be outside of

the Downtown Plan and have your neighborhood decide. We know the principle is the proponent certainty of projects. We are trying to create safe places where everyone supports something rather than becoming characterized.

- ii. **Larry Guenther:** I think the map that we have is there because the zoning is based on use. If we are going to a form-based code, then the use of the buildings is not as important, it's more about the form of the building. If it is more about the form, then should that part be part of the Downtown and have a "Downtown Look" or should it be part of Old North Davis and have that character?
- iii. **Chris Granger:** Clarify from Opticos regarding the forms: the Downtown discussion is about having these sub-areas with a specific form attached to them, wouldn't the neighborhoods, whether in or out of the Downtown Plan, have the opportunity to have their form attached to them with a set of guidelines?
- iv. **John Meyer:** What the guidelines speak to is to each neighborhood and the commercial zones, we need to know how the commercial part maps into residential adjacency.
- v. **Mitali Ganguly:** In terms of the way we describe the character of districts within Downtown, the main difference is what looks more commercial or residential, or more of the block form versus the house form. For instance, the Rice Lane / University Avenue is part of Downtown, but it will be left alone, or it will become one of the transitional areas because of the house-form type of buildings. Within that house-form typology, you can have medium density housing and retail mixed use – the degree of specificity and flexibility depends on the plan.
- vi. **John Meyer:** For example, if the Hibbert Family was to sell their property someday, (G Street) what should it become? It's a significant lot.
- vii. **Mitali Ganguly:** We will be looking at the transitions, even if it is not part of the code, we will be looking at what is happening on the other side of the street – we want to keep the character similar at least. We will have recommendations on what happens on the fringes of Downtown.
- viii. **John Meyer:** There must be a certainty for the proponent of a property. How do we remove some of the risk?
- ix. **Larry Guenther:** An example of that is the 200 C Street building – it didn't have to go to City Council because it fit the zoning.
- x. **Sinisa Novakovic:** B street is a business corridor to a degree. What happens when a developer comes through and receives votes from city council and builds a 4.5 story building next to one of the one-story homes? If the neighborhood will be included in the plan, include it in a manner where this will allow us to set the guidelines.
- xi. **Meg Arnold:** That brings us back to the issue of certainty in multiple directions.
- xii. **John Meyer:** Approval risk is a huge cost driver.
- xiii. **Meg Arnold:** Thank you temporary working group of neighbors. Who is here to speak to the business sub-group?

- xiv. Randy Yackzan: **Business Group:** Doby Fleeman and I had an in-person meeting for the business/ land owners in Downtown. The attendees expressed their concerns regarding the unused property space – land owners are concerned about what we are going to propose on their land. There was an email stating Dan Parolek was going to meet with the land owners. There was a question about the property owners having an opportunity to talk. Jim Stephens, who owns a large amount of property in the Downtown, mentioned that they have concerns as well. In my experience, friends of mine took 4 years to get approval for 5 units. Dan mentioned the layers of rules that we have for Downtown and suggested we wipe out all rules and start over for developing. It is so difficult to develop downtown and we want to push growth downtown. I would like to see the ownership increase. I don't know what the solution is, but we should make it easier to develop and the land owners should be involved in the decision.
- xv. Meg Arnold: Was there input or discussion about some of the ideas that came out of the charrette that they shared perspectives on?
- xvi. Doby Fleeman: Part of the concern is that the preliminary work from Opticos has characteristics that we must assume are appropriate to Davis, including the market hall/maker's space project. As you're looking at planning spaces, how realistic are our assumptions about what kinds of models are working in Davis given our economy? Are we building to satisfy the demand we have today – residents, students – or are we looking to the future of tourism, which means more cars and more parking. Are we going to position ourselves as an arts and entertainment center, where the community will have to invest in an entertainment venue downtown? Are we looking at creating a transit hub and creating a true multi-modal station that would feed into these apartments? How is the committee going to look at those investment questions realistically? Hopefully the objective can translate into reality.
- xvii. Eric Roe: Josh or Sinisa, do you as business owners have any thoughts?
- xviii. Meg Arnold: These are perspectives on the outcome of the charette. What elements of the plan are most important for us to get right and why? Where are the gaps in what has been presented so far?
- xix. Deema Tamimi: **Users/Residents Group:** Our group includes Michelle Byars, Chris Granger, Meg Arnold, and Mary DeWall. We had 3 themes that came up regarding the topic of "What to get right in the plan": getting access and inclusivity, including livability and walkability and not ignoring that parking will be a necessity. We discussed ideas like free buses and bike holds on buses. We discussed that having a place to just "be" in downtown would be useful. More dining options that everyone can enjoy, quieter softer spaces for families and non-students. We discussed small spaces in areas that are tied together, a sense of identity for downtown, the trend for things going online, and its importance for the City to have places where people can commute. We also discussed that people want things that can happen in neighborhoods as well and to potentially create Downtown Davis as a model – for example, West Davis

doesn't have a café, we should have things from downtown in our neighborhoods. A prominent theme is that economics need to be reconsidered. That needs to be for property owners and residents – without economics, the plan will not work, the feasibility study was a good thing. Economic growth and employment opportunities need to be considered. Looking at what the reality is now, and looking at what is it that we want the economics to look like – do we want more businesses to flourish downtown that are office businesses, for example? Particularly we thought about retaining graduates and that having office spaces would make sense. With the trend of freelancing rising, there is a potential for more freelance spaces. Government workers could have a hub here in Davis, so they don't have to commute to Sacramento. We need to figure out the identity we want and whether it works in terms of economics and scaling. Keeping in mind our local businesses, making sure that Downtown is a place where they can stay and thrive. The last few discussions we had were density and height – that needs to be figured out. We also have a concern that the university needs to participate more. UC Davis decision making has become somewhat isolated for residents, staff and students, and we would like to see the university participate more like a partner with the City. We want to look at questions like how is the money staying on campus? Is there a way to have the Downtown retailers to tap into selling on campus? The last question was having to do with gaps in what has been presented – we discussed that there needs to be more information on how form-based code impacts development – how can form-based code impact economic developments? Can form-based code determine what spaces are used for and influence certain types of economic development? Could Davis have a cooperative fund where the community comes together to purchase parts of Downtown. Can form based code address cooperative models? The gap concerning process centered around the need for more neighborhood involvement. Potentially making the charrettes more focused on the neighborhoods. There is also a desire for more digital engagement throughout the process. Our last idea is about taking our meetings on the road to get more people involved – having pop-up workshops in the neighborhoods.

- xx. Chris Granger: I want to reiterate what we started with this access question and the need for lower income community members to have access to whatever kind of housing we will have in Downtown.
- xxi. Cheryl Essex: **Planners and Liaisons Group:** While the planners didn't convene, I worked with Bob on a method where the planning commissioners can weigh in on what they've seen. One commissioner commented about flexibility, economic reality, and housing diversity. We had a planning commission meeting last night and brought up this question: the biggest topic of conversation was about parking. A lot of people say, "parking is not available, but I always find a parking space". But the parking is important and maybe technology solutions can help people be more comfortable with the parking that's available. As we develop there has been expressed concern that less parking will kill

downtown. Another was a concern about how we think about experiences rather than shopping because of the economic trends in retail – the trends are more art-oriented and making sure that we highlight our arts to bring people Downtown.

- xxii.** John Meyer: I have a brief planning comment: the challenges the Downtown is having is that every project is a “one-off”. I am trying to underscore the value of this exercise – people need to make a proposal that is compliant, this creates a huge advantage because it extracts two years out of the development process.
 - xxiii.** Matt Dulcich – From the planning group, we are wanting a process theme and illustrating to the community the process of this committee in a way that is successful and energetic and positive, and modeling that for a General Plan Commission. Creating a “Downtown Way” that is positive and a model for the rest of the General Plan Update – what is the vision for what the community wants, creating a vision of “what could happen”.
 - xxiv.** Deema Tamimi: For the Users Group, we talked about biking, wanting Downtown to be a more comfortable place to bike for families.
 - xxv.** Meg Arnold: From the business owner/operators in the room, do you have comments from the charrette?
 - xxvi.** Eric Roe: I would love to redevelop a new building in Downtown Davis – a 5-6 story building. However, there are pros and cons to everything; when you develop something for sale – you’re at the mercy of the market, which could take a turn anytime, if you do a rental project, that’s a project that may take a few years to make money off of, so you’re in it for the long term. In my opinion, a rental project in Downtown Davis would be less risky than a for sale project. So, is there something the City can do to help incentivize land owners Downtown – long-time land owners – to redevelop their sites into more of a project that will improve the Downtown? Incentivize me to help transform Downtown into something I want to see. Something like eliminating parking requirements in new buildings my help since if you cannot provide the amount of required parking, you pay fees in lieu of parking – doing things like this would make projects Downtown feasible.
 - xxvii.** Joshua Chapman: My feedback on the questionnaire we completed included looking at city-owned properties – sending out RFPs about city-owned properties. For the charrette, it looks like we are pigeon-holed into this 2-4 story range. My concern is that we would not have something bigger or the conversation about it.
 - xxviii.** Sinisa Novakovic: I was discouraged by the numbers that Matt presented, but perhaps there was a silver lining. Maybe the only way to develop downtown is for developers to develop to sell the properties to owner-operators of businesses. The only way I can afford the \$10,000 in rent for Mishka’s is because I am putting the money into something – that business.
- c. Public Comment

- i. Tia Will: Addressing the neighborhoods, I would like to see the Downtown Plan separate from Old East Davis. I see it as 3 sections: Downtown, a transition zone, and Old East Davis, primarily residential.
- ii. Doby Fleeman: To the issue of opportunity and the potential for Downtown Davis resonating with the degrees coming from the University. The University could play a huge role in terms of advocacy. We have so few businesses in Downtown for graduates. We need to make a conservative effort to figure out how we can bring in the employers that will offer the types of office jobs graduates are looking for.
- iii. Matt Dulcich: Sometimes it's not clear to us (the University) if our efforts are useful to a project or tainting a project.
- iv. Kathy Forkas: As far as neighborhoods and transitions, I like the idea of going through the planning process with Opticos in the Old East Downtown transition zone. We don't have a model for developing that type of neighborhood and there is so much conflict in those zones – I think it would be great to develop a model for those.

7. Visual Preference Survey

Committee member, Judy Corbett, conducted a Visual Preference Survey related to architectural character to augment images presented in Participatory Design Workshop.

- a. Judy Corbett: This is something to help Opticos see what we want the feeling of Downtown Davis to look like. I gave a map and a tally sheet to everyone. The map has the neighborhoods marked out. Each of the photos on the screen has a number, if you like the photo then put the number on the neighborhood you like. If you don't like the photo look at all, then don't put it on. There are 40 photos total. The feedback will be tallied.

8. Survey of Committee Members Related to Specific Plan Boundaries and Guiding Principles.

The committee discussed the results of the survey.

- a. Meg Arnold: One of the questions in the survey was in regard to the planning area itself and the places we wish to add or not add to the plan and why. In the same survey there was a second question about providing recommendations for guiding principles for future. What I would like to propose from a process perspective, specific to the guiding principles portion, is that we provide any pithy additional comment to what we've already gathered and ask the consultant team to consider our ideas before the next charrette.
- b. Chris Granger: In our last discussion, we heard from Dan that we should have a working set of principles that we are flexible with and that we return to them after we get through another iteration – so it becomes part of the end of the planning process.
- c. Meg Arnold: As a process I'm proposing that we ask the consultants to absorb all of the collective wisdom from the surveys and come back with slight tweaks but keep them flexible before the next charrette and understanding that the principles may evolve as the work becomes more specific.

- d. Mitali Ganguly:** We will approach the guiding principles as a set of metrics, to an extent it should be based in feasibility. They are parameters to make sure we are touching on all the important things in the charrette and in our design work. But they may change while they get codified. The reason they were so broad is it is the beginning of the planning process, as we plan further they will become more focused.
- e. Meg Arnold:** Do we need a motion on this?
- f. Bob Wolcott:** It would be nice to know when the general set of principles are coming back – will they be shown at the second charrette?
- g. Mitali Ganguly:** Our understanding is that it will be included in the second charrette as an update of “Working principles”
- h. Bob Wolcott:** We could present an update on the working principles during the first DPAC meeting at the charrette or send an email out.
- i. John Meyer:** I think it would be good for the DPAC to see the principles before they are released to the charrette.
- j. Larry Guenther:** It would be a good topic to discuss at the charrette, but we should see them before that.
- k. Meg Arnold:** Did we see the guiding principles before the last charrette?
- l. Mitali Ganguly:** Yes, at the DPAC meeting before the last charrette.
- m. Bob Wolcott:** If we were to discuss the principles, I would send out the agenda and packet materials a week before the DPAC charrette meeting.
- n. Meg Arnold:** All these responses were in our agenda packet tonight; the consultants will assimilate whatever seems to be pertinent from our writing suggestions and tweak the existing guiding principles that are already public. In that context, is your concern about not seeing them ahead of time still there?
- o. John Meyer:** I don’t think anything in our basket is bad but there is so much out there, I don’t see this as controversial, but if we are going to articulate the purpose of our exercise, the material needs to be coherent.
- p. Chris Granger:** Our first survey we did asked us about the principles and then we have been asked again, so I’m concerned that both sets of input have been included. Catherine has raised a different stylistic approach which is fundamentally different than what the principles are constructed right now, I’m interested if we have decided if that’s important and whether we can agree. Do the consultants have a way to incorporate if that’s how the principles will be constructed now.
- q. Mitali Ganguly:** We can take a first pass at it – maybe we don’t discuss it at the charrette, but then we lose the potential of missing out on community feedback.
- r. Chris Granger:** Maybe they present to us in a meeting at the charrette.
- s. Meg Arnold:** That’s what Bob had suggested, but the concern is that it is that that’s a much larger forum to have that discussion for the first time.
- t. Mitali Ganguly:** Our concern is that we will not have enough time for people to react to it if we present it that Thursday. Is there a feasible way to present it at the opening presentation?
- u. Larry Guenther:** Can we put it as one of the boards?
- v. Mitali Ganguly:** That is what we were thinking if we could gather feedback from the public and tell them we will discuss at the meeting on Thursday.

- w. Bob Wolcott: We should use words like public review, draft, etc. – using that language will help. If the group trusts Mitali to refine it, and volunteer of 2 people on the committee want to refine it further.
- x. Meg Arnold: We do not have time to complete a survey monkey. Are there two or three committee members willing to be a first pass sounding board to the first draft before the charrette?
 - i. Larry, John and Judy volunteer
- y. Meg Arnold: I motion that the DPAC will ask the consulting team to take a first pass at melding our input into the existing guiding principles, will provide that for a quick turn review to a subcommittee of three members of the DPAC: Larry, John, and Judy, after which review and feedback, will be not finalized, but iterated again, and then made available at the charrette for feedback by way of general comment.
 - i. Larry Guenther seconds the motion.
 - ii. Motion passes with consensus.
- z. Meg Arnold: On the same survey we discussed what potential parts of the Downtown Plan’s geography and what should be included or not. We had 12 responses to the survey. The Amtrak Railroad Depot was unanimously felt to be important and relevant enough to Downtown that it should be included in the Plan.
- aa. Larry Guenther: I move that Amtrak gets accepted into the Downtown Plan.
- bb. Meg Arnold: We will need to take public comment on all items. We have one motion on the table to include Amtrak in the Downtown Plan area. The next most popular item is to include the Boy Scout Cabin/adjacent parking lot in the Downtown Plan area. 11 of 12 of us thought it should be included in the Plan area.
- cc. Deema Tamimi: I would change mine to be ‘yes’, but the reason I didn’t suggest Boy Scout Cabin because I didn’t want to be complicated and focus on getting the Amtrak in. Boy scout cabin is unanimous.
- dd. Meg Arnold: The next most unanimous item was the Davis Commons, North West of the tunnel. 9 of the 12 of us felt that that should be included in the Plan. This doesn’t mean that we are able to completely include it in the Plan, but we should consider it while creating the Plan because of the impact it has with the existing Downtown Plan area.
- ee. John Meyer: This item has a significant historical relevance, it used to be University property, not the City’s property.
- ff. Meg Arnold: Unanimity drops off after those 3 items – the 6 votes in favor was for the Design House and the City lot off Olive Drive. The West side of I street, with the car wash and SPCA received 5 votes.
- gg. John Meyer: The ‘no’ vote on University Avenue neighborhood is significant because that’s a change in the current boundaries of the Plan area.
- hh. Cheryl Essex: Was it people’s intention to remove it from the Plan?
- ii. Meg Arnold: I presume so. 4 people wanted it in, and 8 people wanted it removed. Is there interest in taking a single motion on the 3 areas that we have the largest agreement on: Amtrak, Boy Scout Cabin, and Davis Commons?

9. Public Comment:

- a. Doby Fleeman: To the importance of the multi-modal center, if we are going to be authentic with comparing ourselves to communities like Redwood City, and others, we need to take it seriously. This is how our workforce would transport into Davis, we also don't have effective outbound transportation for those who work in Sacramento.
- b. Alan Miller: I live in Old East Davis – Old East Davis should not be in the plan – it's not appropriate. Somewhere in the plan says that the character of the neighborhood is of the utmost importance and we believe that since we live there. The Amtrak station in particular – I work in rail transportation – the depot has the potential to be an incredible transportation center for the town, there's a real potential there that hasn't been brought up. But also, don't fool yourselves about the rumors about the railroad and Amtrak. The North/South rail line is not going anywhere for a long time. The depot is not being moved in any short timeline. There is a real need to put in a second platform there and have access either over or under – under is easier so we don't have people walking across a live rail line.
- c. Kathy Forkas: I wonder about the feasibility about moving the tree that comes with the Boy Scout Cabin.
- d. Meg Arnold: The idea would be to move the entire parcel: tree, cabin, and parking lot. The motion is to ask that the Amtrak Depot, Boy Scout Cabin and parking lot, and the Davis Commons be explicitly included in the plan.
 - i. Larry Guenther seconds the motion.
- e. Bob Wolcott: This is something only voting members should vote on.
- f. Eric Roe: I feel strongly that the carwash and SPCA should be considered in being included in the Downtown Plan area. It's adjacent to the railroad district.
- g. Larry Guenther: That area is commercial, so I understand. The idea is form-based code, and there is a railroad track right through that area. As far as thinking about the form of the building, it seems to me that the Old East Neighborhood is the driver of Downtown.
- h. Meg Arnold: The motion was specific to those 3 items that had the most agreement. All in favor about the motion?
 - i. All but Eric Roe are in favor.
 - ii. Eric Roe: I abstain from the vote on this particular motion.
- i. Meg Arnold: The motion has passed with one abstention. Do we wish further discussion on other elements of the geography?
- j. Eric Roe: I would like to add to the first motion, and I appreciate that the section remains part of Old East Davis.
- k. Chris Granger: I would suggest that part of the conundrum of voting in the Amtrak station, is that it is now a clearly adjacent property that needs to be addressed in a station plan. There is still a railroad track in the middle, and that area hasn't been a commercial area for many years. Those issues are real.
- l. Larry Guenther: If we are going to form based code, the form of the structures has more importance than the use. We can discuss what form belongs there.
- m. John Meyer: It seems like that property has all of its circulation and access through the neighborhood. So, while it's adjacent to the Depot, you still have to come through a neighborhood to get there.
- n. Cheryl Essex: What if the railroad track goes away?

- o. Larry Guenther: We can make a motion and vote on that piece.
- p. Meg Arnold: OK
- q. Todd Edelman: Is that ‘wall’ of this is actually an important part of the form-based code?
- r. Mitali Ganguly: It is and it’s also what happens to the public realm.
- s. Eric Roe: I move to include the SPCA and car wash to the Downtown Plan area.
 - i. Judy Corbett seconds.
- t. Meg Arnold: All in favor?
 - i. 5 yes, 1 opposed, 2 abstained
- u. Meg Arnold: Does anyone want to speak to other geographies?
- v. Chris Granger: I would like to hear from the University/Rice Lane neighborhood representative about this “in or out of the Plan” question.
- w. Sinisa Novakovic: On one hand, I fear that if we do not address form-based code that we will be at the whim of 3-votes at the City Council in terms of new development.
- x. Meg Arnold: Do we have any further geographies that we would like to put forward as a motion?
- y. Justin Goss: I believe it was you who suggested we include the E and First Street entrance to Downtown Davis.
- z. John: That area is in the boundaries.

10. Other Committee, Staff or Consultant Communications

This item will include: The Committee commented on the draft proposal by member Chris Granger for an article for the media and how to proceed and any communications related to community outreach for the second Participatory Design Workshop on July 10-14, 201 were discussed.

DPAC Comments

- a. Chris Granger: To clarify what has transpired over the last few weeks regarding the article: very few people were interested in actually participating and it’s clear that this will be adding workload to the staff, therefore we are not pursuing that idea. If there is a way to think about doing this in the future, and anyone is interested, please talk to me.
- b. Bob Wolcott: We are working with AIM to commence community outreach for the next charrette, we will need the DPAC’s assistance as well.
- c. Chris Granger: The Enterprise is absent and if we want an article we will have to write it.
- d. Meg Arnold: General outreach is the same as the first charrette and DPAC will do their part.

11. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

- a. Alan Miller: I have one minor complaint: we, in Old East Davis, constantly have to reiterate what our actual boundaries are. Google the Old East Davis neighborhood – we run along Yale Drive and L Street and the railroad tracks. This is an overlay area here. That may seem minor, but we are constantly being told that this is not part of our neighborhood, and it is, and we are part of the Downtown Plan.
- b. Ani Machan: The virtual workshop is not apparent on the Davis Website.
- c. Diane Parro: We will take care of that tomorrow morning.

12. Updated Schedule of Meetings and Adjournment

- a.** July 10-14, 2018 is Public Charrette #2 (with DPAC meetings on July 12 and 14)
- b.** August 2018: DPAC meeting with the summary report on Public Charrette #2 and the next steps in the Plan.
- c.** Bob Wolcott: Potential other future dates include: September 11th meeting with the Planning Commission and Council, and either October 4th or 11th DPAC meeting to review any changes that came out of the prior meeting. Following, the consultant will draft the Specific Plan.
- d.** John Meyer: What will Council be discussing?
- e.** Bob Wolcott: The product and key concepts that are developed to date.
- f.** John Meyer: I can't see them presenting on something that we are not on board with. It seems that we will have needed to provide input on some of the topics.
- g.** Bob Wolcott: There will be a closing presentation, but we can discuss the idea of having a DPAC meeting in August.
- h.** Todd Edelman: There are several committees being represented here that are non-voting members, and now the plan seems to be just going to the Planning Commission, what is the rationale for the other commissions not being part of that closer contact with the Planning Commission, Council and DPAC?
- i.** Diane Parro: Staff is not prepared with a simple answer for that.
- j.** Todd Edelman: On the website, looking at the calendar, I don't see where we are on the timeline – is there a way to make the calendar more readable?
- k.** Mitali Ganguly: That was a preliminary schedule and it will be clarified.
- l.** Chris Granger: We just voted on the inclusions on these new areas, is that going to be showed to Council before September?
- m.** Bob Wolcott: No, but it will be reviewed as part of the check-in.
- n.** Meg Arnold: Seeing no further comment, this meeting is adjourned.