



Meeting Minutes

City of Davis

Downtown Davis Plan Advisory Committee Meeting

Senior Center Activity Room, 646 A Street

Thursday, May 31, 2018

7:00 P.M.

Committee Members: Meg Arnold (Chair), Michelle Byars (Vice Chair), Catherine Brinkley, Chris Granger, Larry Guenther, Darren McCaffrey, John Meyer, Eric Roe, Deema Tamimi, Rob White, Randy Yackzan

Liaison Members: Ryan Dodge, Matt Dulcich, Cheryl Essex, Rob Hofmann , Dan Carson on behalf of Justin Goss

Absent: Judy Corbett, Josh Chapman, Mary DeWall, Sinisia Novakovic, Justin Goss

Council Members: Brett Lee, Lucas Frerichs

City Staff: Bob Wolcott, Diane Parro, Heidi Tschudin

Consultants: Dan Parolek and Mitali Ganguly (Opticos Design), and Isabelle Gaillard (AIM)

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

- a. The meeting was called to order at 7:04 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

- a. The agenda was approved by consensus.

3. Approval of Minutes (7:05 – 7:10 PM)

- a. Chris Granger made the following minor changes
 - i. April 19 – clarification on verbiage she said – charge, not crusade.
 - ii. April 28 – she asked consultants to show examples with fewer cars.
- b. The draft minutes from April 19, 2018, April 26, 2018 (at mid-point of design charrette), and April 28, 2018 (at closing of design charrette) were approved by consensus.

4. Brief Announcements from City Council Member(s), Chair, Committee Members, Staff or Consultants

- a. Brett Lee: I stopped to show my support of this process – this group is important. It’s all start group of people. You bring important perspectives, and it is a balanced group. I believe this group can dig in, find best practices. Our lack of appearance at these meetings is not an indication of our support. I anticipate us moving forward with your recommendations – I cannot say with full certainty, as I do not yet know it. We will be more involved towards the end. This is an important step towards the general plan. Downtown is important and we need to get it right. Have confidence in your ability to give us good advice. Thank you for your commitment of time – I understand it is hard work. I don’t expect the community will be 100% consensus, but thus will be a good starting point.
- b. Lucas Frerichs: Thank you for being here. Downtown is a jewel and I appreciate your engagement here. We have used these types of temporary bodies for many years, that do heavy lifting in the community. These bodies serve as extra eyes and ears for the council. Your work is important and we have a lot of faith in this process. The charrette was awesome – Opticos did a good job.
- c. Meg Arnold: Tonight, we have a special meeting agenda. I want to give you a background as to why is popped up so late. We added a working group component to bring new perspective to the group. We realized after it was proposed that it needed to be agendized. Tonight, we will just discuss that approach. We will actually implement it in the next DPAC meeting.
- d. Bob Wolcott: The councilmembers will stay involved as there will be formal check in on directions after the charrette.
- e. Darren McCaffrey: I won’t be at the June 14 meeting.
- f. Michelle Byars: I won’t either.

5. Discussion of Outcomes of Participatory Design Workshop #1 on April 24 – 28, 2018 and Results of Survey on Key Concepts

- a. Dan Parolek of Opticos briefly presents a summary report of the Participatory Design Workshop
- b. DPAC Comments:
 - i. Darren: Is there a way to enable the gradual transformation? Would it be in periods of years? In terms of economic development? Short term versus long term?
 - ii. Dan Parolek: Specific plan is legally required to have a phasing aspect. In terms of development and how money is spent. We can also think about reassessing aspects of the plan every couple of years so that it stays fresh and on track.
 - iii. Chris Granger: In the form based code part of the plan, you would building short term and long term phasing for sub-district?
 - iv. Darren McCaffrey: There was a lot of discussion about height – would form based code be flexible? If someone wants to build a 4-story building – will there be constraints that make it that you can only build up this high, with this constraint?

Dan Parolek: We usually like to set a cap on the height – we want to make sure what we are proposing could potentially happen, that is why we are involving Matt Kowta. As we work through the second charrette, we can talk about how that can be regulated and test those ideas with the community members

Michelle Byars: Would there be a minimum height

Dan Parolek: Sometimes yes, sometimes no. We can talk about that in the future. You need to think about what works economically. We are careful in thinking about minimums.

- v. Rob White: Something that has come up are opportunity zones – which will impact everything on the other side of the train tracks – it’s an investment tool that is in the tax reform – it will drive decision making irrespective of this process. We need to know what we are not doing as well. It allows people to take capital gains out of the stock market. It’s an “L” shape based on disadvantage communities. The zone is stuck for 10 years unless there’s a congressional level change. Chris Granger – Diane can you share a link with us?

Diane Parro: Yes

Dan Parolek: Do the projects need to meet zoning?

Rob White: They need adhere to current zoning law. It will drive decision making.

- vi. Meg Arnold: We will now move into discussion.

- vii. Larry Guenther: I have a question for Dan regarding height minimum – 100 x 100 lots – I would like to see what change that makes, as well as incentives.

Dan Parolek: We did study lots that size.

- viii. Meg Arnold: Your comments lead into the survey. I found the survey results informative. Let’s talk about general impressions.

- ix. Chris Granger: I appreciate the written comments.

- x. Darren McCaffrey: I agree. Regarding the guiding principles – there was one about balancing historical objectives with the larger vision – not to sound insensitive – but it’s hard to find architecture in downtown Davis that screams save me. I wonder if that needs to be in the guiding principles? Can it be a lower priority?

John Meyer: We need to focus on what’s worthy and allow flexibility on other items. The Hunt Boyer is worth saving – but some are not.

Michelle Byars: The balance isn’t just historical but the hard spaces in downtown.

Larry Guenther: History isn’t just the last 100 years, it’s the next 100 years – it’s also worth keeping in mind we are creating buildings that people might want to save in 100 years.

John Meyer: There are too many layers – we need to pick the icons and be clear about it.

- xi. Meg Arnold: People seem to like the guiding principles, but let’s talk about it. *Meg reads principles out loud.*

- xii. Catherine Brinkley: It might behoove us to think about equity and environmental justice.

- xiii.** Darren McCaffrey: I like the comments someone wrote about trying to base what we are doing on a need to serve people who don't have the means to help themselves. The environmental justice is important with sustainability being an overarching theme. But if we think about sustainability in a holistic sense, we need to consider everyone.
- xiv.** Dan Carson: I like the word vibrant, but maybe change it to "Craft a program for culturally and economically vibrant and resilient downtown."
- xv.** Rob White: This is planning speak.
- xvi.** Dan Parolek: In past projects, we have gotten caught up in guiding principles and have recently stopped including them. People do get caught up in these, but what is more important are the big ideas we are trying to reinforce with the plan.
- xvii.** Deema Tamini: I like including accessibility included in these. I think we should highlight transportation instead of parking in #5.
- xviii.** Michelle Byars: Who is the audience? If it's going out, we should change the language. I also agree – it needs equity – especially intergenerational. I don't like the idea of brand, but identity.
- xix.** Larry Guenther: I like that these are centered around people.
- xx.** Cheryl Essex: Downtown as a neighborhood – we might want to consider that being part of this. We might also want to think about the larger city – how downtown contributes to the larger city. Perhaps how downtown can take some of the pressure off the single-family neighborhoods.
- xxi.** John Meyer: The principles are important as a filter for every move you make, so when you make a major move, and you put it against the filter of principles, does it map to those? Some of those seem tactical in output – for example, the brand. Need to think, would a project map to these characteristics?
- xxii.** Catherine Brinkley: With these guiding principles, there is a shift from problem focused (like parking) to more asset-based development. Positive ways to think about this: Davis is a place that is affordable – that is a huge guiding principle. Or a place that you grow children with good food, nature, and nurture. Or a place that builds multi-generational, cultural and economic health. Building a place that is connected to its region with opportunities for pleasant physical exercise and day-to-day transit.
- xxiii.** Rob White: Dan, you did a great job in one of our first meetings – we are spending a lot of money storing metal. We need to invest forward, not backward. We need to do early starts – 3rd street – why don't we just close it now? Just see what happens – not permanent. It's doesn't cost much to shut it down and see where it goes.
- xxiv.** Chris Granger: Should sustainability be in the principles? Where does this emphasis belong?
- xxv.** Bob Wolcott: Staff usually does not insert its opinions, but we like to work with the consultants to mesh guiding principles with goals –

what we are missing are housing and job opportunities. Goals would help us answer why there might be changes from what exists.

- xxvi.** Rob White: Becoming a matrix instead of a statement.
- xxvii.** Matt Dulcich: Sometimes it's at the end of a planning period where things become crystalized you get a better sense of what you want on the front page. Let's gather ideas, carry them with us, and look at what's the back, versus the front page. Sometimes you need to write the executive summary after the term paper.
- xxviii.** Meg Arnold: My take away from the survey was the apparent extent of general agreement. Our least agreement was on question 9 – regarding the parking garage.
- xxix.** Eric Roe: I was also confused.
- xxx.** Darren McCaffrey: I was also confused. It is a sticking point for business owners - I understand they want their customers to have access to parking.
- xxxi.** Larry Guenther: How is a building a short-term solution?
- xxxii.** Eric Roe: Before the plan, I thought we needed a parking garage, but after going through the planning process, I think we should consider other options first, like on street parking meters etc.
- xxxiii.** Meg Arnold: Takes poll if people want parking garage: 4 neutral, remaining DPAC members vote thumbs down.
- xxxiv.** Randy Yackzan: It's impossible to build a parking garage. We are unsure of the future of transportation and parking –maybe we won't need the parking structure
- xxxv.** Cheryl Essex: One thing to think about – the city owns acreage that is now parking. If the city wants to sell a parking lot that provides community amenities, you may want to look at building parking garage right outside of downtown. Maybe replacement parking, but not new parking.
- xxxvi.** John Meyer: There aren't many vibrant downtowns where you can expect to park right in front of the store you want to go to.
- xxxvii.** Larry Guenther: You can find parking almost always – the city did just build a lot for employees. Parking is not bad, but it's also not perfect.
- xxxviii.** Michelle Byars: I agree with Cheryl, I would like to see less street parking and more perimeter parking on Olive Drive. If we do create one, I would hope it can be later repurposed.
- xxxix.** Rob Hoffman: There is a downtown business owner desire for a parking structure. The University is considering peripheral parking as well. There is an opportunity to combine both our needs.
- xl.** John Meyer: There was discussion before redevelopment got pulled about the potential of putting a garage in downtown. There was a plan was in the works. It's so interesting, the downtown business perspective compared to peripheral business where parking is part of your rent and it's private property. This is wielding public assets at no cost – the limited number of businesses downtown would tens of millions to finance it. If you are going to do it, it has to have some public benefit, besides parking.

- xli.** Chris Granger: I am hopeful that the city council is moving on items from the Downtown Parking Task Force to happen if not now, during the general plan process.
- xlii.** Meg Arnold: Question 3 on the study area boundary – Let’s talk about the options that people are in favor of considering expanding. Adding the Depot, the carwash, Davis Commons, west Olive and Richards, the civic center, the PG&E corps yard.
- xliii.** Larry Guenther: Are there areas that are going to affect what we are doing? And do we want to increase the size of downtown?
- xliv.** Catherine Brinkley: Bob, can we do that? This project has a budget attached to this. Is it wise to plan places we don’t have the background?
- xlv.** Bob Wolcott: We will have that to deal with if it comes. I did put out a memo on the purpose of the planning area. Being in a planning area does not presume what we are doing with those areas. We currently don’t have the scope to do detailed work on many extra sites but we could call out what needs to be done in the phasing plan.
- xlvi.** Chris Granger: Is that true for everything we are talking about? Are there things we can include that won’t create problems?
- xlvii.** Dan Parolek: Richards gateway is part of the plan – and other sites are not. We did dabble in those at the charrette, but believed we needed to in order to understand the potential of the area. Any properties North of 5th, we don’t recommend going there.
- xlviii.** Dan Carson for Justin: The Amtrak station is so integral to this plan. What are our tools – land, city code, - there is an opportunity there.
- xlix.** Bob Wolcott: It’s a responsibility to us to give reasons why or why not we have included or didn’t include sites. This will be helpful when we go to council. We need to take a position based on reasons.
 - i.** Chris Granger: From what Dan is saying, we need to make targeted recommendations about that – didn’t the city just get a grant to do a plan for the Amtrak station? Can we give guidance to the future plans? Phasing or importance.
 - ii.** Todd Edelman: Amtrak is a study not a plan.
 - iii.** Darren McCaffrey: I don’t understand why some parts are included – what about the Co-Op?
 - liii.** John Meyer: Explain the way things are the way they are with historic reasons.
 - liv.** Deema Tamini: I think Amtrak should be part of downtown, but I’m wondering if we should do another survey – we move faster if we do surveys.
 - lv.** Meg Arnold: we should get down our general view of reasons why we have included some districts and not include others.
 - lvi.** Chris Granger: It would be helpful to have options for process forward. Can we include the Amtrak station, but include it in future plans? Is there a way forward that keeps us on track?
 - lvii.** Larry Guenther: Form Based Codes – what form do we want to have? Do we want it to have neighborhood form or downtown form.

- lviii.** Cheryl Essex: I agree and think the Depot should be included – it has a huge potential effect on downtown if that rail could become a rail to trail and the parking lot become a park – could be a great public space.
- lix.** Meg Arnold: I want to do a legitimate check in – one of the frustrations is that there is less opportunity to discuss, and more presentation. So tonight we did mostly discussion. Thank you Opticos for the quick presentation. Does everyone appreciate this format?
- lx.** Catherine Brinkley: Can we do a survey afterward, so we know where we met consensus and where we haven't? It could help shape future conversation. Perhaps on boundary or guiding principles.
- lxi.** Meg Arnold: There was a focus on equity, but not much consensus on the guiding principles.
- lxii.** Catherine Brinkley: I'm thinking qualitative versus quantitative.
- lxiii.** Dan Parolek: Let's not have the text drive the vision, let's let the vision drive the text.
- lxiv.** Meg Arnold: Catherine can you put together the next survey?
- lxv.** Michelle Byars: Connections are important to me.
- lxvi.** Meg Arnold: Motion to put together a follow up survey regarding boundaries? Is there any public comment?
- lxvii.** Todd Edelmann: I would like in the next charrette for people to understand the boundary. Amtrak may not be in the boundary because there might not have been as many trains.
- lxviii.** Meg Arnold: All in favor? Motion carries.
- lxix.** Rob Hoffman: We should include public comment earlier in the process.

6. Proposal by Chair for Working Groups to Address Questions Related to Downtown Plan (Special Meeting Agenda)

- a.** Meg Arnold briefly describes the working groups, as outlined in the special agenda.
 - i.** Chris Granger: I would like to understand the groupings.
 - ii.** Meg Arnold: There are representatives of businesses, liaisons of other entities, neighborhood reps, and builders and catch all.
 - iii.** Catherine Brinkley: My concern is that a grouping will not allow for conversation across groupings. I appreciate being able to hear their perspectives.
 - iv.** Meg Arnold: I feared that, but I was hoping the groups could present a cohesive perspective to the group and use it to frame the conversation at the next meeting.
 - v.** Michelle Byars: There's a potential of people being grouped and taking positions. Maybe we can put ourselves in categories we would like to hear perspectives from.
 - vi.** Larry Guenther: My perspective was that this was an opportunity for people to present more efficiently.
 - vii.** Deema Tamini: I can see where this can cause issues – splitting people up, but what I did like is that we are trying to figure out what is important to the different groups within the group. Maybe we should

think about all of the needs for each of these groups – we need to put ourselves in their shoes and think about what is important to others.

- viii. Meg Arnold: This would be a brief creation for one discussion.
 - ix. John Meyer: Perhaps we can do groups, and join others as we want. We do need to be mindful of the Brown Act when meeting. Focused prompts would help us along.
 - x. Dan Carson: We did this before and tried to make this less work on staff.
 - xi. Chris Granger: Maybe there is a way we can cross pollinate the groups for that discussion. For example, I could give comments to a group regarding my perspective – it could help to have more content processed.
 - xii. Meg Arnold: This may create Brown Act violations.
 - xiii. Rob White: We have already figured out that we can do a survey monkey.
 - xiv. Larry Guenther: Brown Act is discussion, not input.
 - xv. Diane Parro: It is strongly recommended that you communicate with staff.
 - xvi. Meg Arnold: Our next meeting is in two weeks. I will amend the motion - Motion to create temporary working groups in the categories that were previously identified and for each of those groups to tackle those questions identified – then bring cohesive outcomes to the group to facilitate the conversation on June 14. And that we will create a survey monkey. You will have one week to input into the survey, one week to meet.
- b. Public Comment:
 - i. Todd Edelman: As someone who has initiated a sub committee on parking, it would be useful to have a good interface between subcommittee and its parallel in the DPAC.
 - c. All in favor, motion passes.

7. Preparations for Participatory Design Workshop #2 on July 10 – 14, 2018

- a. Dan Parolek of Opticos Design gives short presentation on intent and objectives for the workshop:
 - i. Focus on transitions on the edges
 - ii. Green infrastructure and sustainability
 - iii. Basic concepts of form-based code
 - iv. Format will be the same as the first charrette
- b. DPAC discussion on outreach tactics, techniques and similarities for the first workshop
 - i. Chris Granger: Do we have information on the virtual community workshop? Can we have promotional material?
 - ii. Isabelle Gaillard: Yes, the virtual community workshop will launch on June 14th. We will provide flyers and can provide promotional flyers.

8. Proposal by DPAC Member for Community Engagement / Articles for Media.

- a. Member Chris Granger proposes community engagement articles for media.

- b. Public Comment:**
 - i.** Todd Edelman: The public comment does not reflect that of the committee regarding the parking structure.
- c. DPAC Discussion:**
 - i.** Darren McCaffrey: What is the approach and task?
 - ii.** Chris Granger: To co-write personal perspective articles. It is not a position piece.
 - iii.** John Meyer: That might cause problems and make us play defense.
 - iv.** Darren McCaffrey: It might need to be clearly a personal piece or specifically regarding the process.
 - v.** Chris Granger: I envision Randy and me teaming up to talk about sustainability in downtown. Perhaps we have an internal editorial team to make it easier to process.
 - vi.** Deema Tamini: If its regarding the process, might be better for it to be individual articles.
 - vii.** Darren McCaffrey: The encouragement to interact with the community and through the enterprise is good.
 - viii.** Chris Granger: My goal is to get us to work together to write pieces and learn from each other.
 - ix.** John Meyer: We need to be mindful that this may be some people's first understanding of the process. Perhaps let's bring a draft into the next meeting.
 - x.** Michelle Byars: Is the purpose outreach, to bring us closer, or to get our opinions out into the world?
 - xi.** Chris Granger: All three – but not so much personal opinion, but personal perspective.
 - xii.** Meg Arnold: Sounds like we will create a draft.
 - xiii.** Heidi Tschudin: Feedback would come back through the staff to feed to everyone.
 - xiv.** Rob White: There is a luke-warmness on this issue. Those who want to write a article reach out to the city and see the level of intrigue.
 - xv.** Meg Arnold: Motion to fill these in and provide them to staff by Wednesday. Staff will not process them – in addition two volunteers will write an article.
- d. Motion passes.**

9. Proposal by DPAC Member for a Visual Preference Survey of Desired Building Types and Architecture.

- a.** Bob Wolcott discusses Judy's proposal by member Judy Corbett for visual preference survey with members to submit images.
- b. DPAC Comments:**
 - i.** John Meyer: I would hope that Judy has a good stock of photos instead of waiting for the committee to input photos.
 - ii.** Chris Granger: Will there be a conflict in timing for the virtual workshop or the charrette?
 - iii.** Dan Parolek: We would need these 10 days before the charrette.

- iv. Diane Parro: I would be worried about running two surveys at the same time.
 - v. Cheryl Essex: It would be a DPAC only survey of photos that Judy would put together.
 - vi. Rob White: We don't have time – it sounds like it needs to be discussed during a meeting. Either we add a meeting, or it is something we forego.
 - vii. John Meyer: Does the next charrette lock in the building types?
 - viii. Dan Parolek: It would not be helpful to receive them after we have locked into a character.
 - ix. Mitali Ganguly: People give general community feedback on renderings.
 - x. John Meyer: We ask Judy to create a visual survey for the consultants.
 - xi. Meg Arnold: Public Comment? Discussion?
 - xii. Chris Granger: Maybe she can do the survey for the 14th.
- c. Motion passes.

10. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

- a. Todd Edleman: I want to push forward street design prototypes so when we start to build stuff, the foundation is concrete.

11. Other Committee, Staff or Consultant Communications

- a. Heidi Tschudin: As the DPAC role changes to deliberation, we will go through process of how you gather information, we would like you to put a standing item on the agenda of groups you represent to keep people in the public informed.
- b. Chris Granger: Natural Resources Commission would like to have a connection. They want to know how they are included in the review process of the plan later down the road.
- c. Diane Parro: It is a public meeting and they are welcome to come. The document will get circulated to all the commissions.
- d. Randy Yackzan: I was appointed by a city council member and I am supposed to represent development interests – do I reach out and have meetings?
- e. Heidi Tschudin: No, my statement was directed towards representatives of the neighborhood groups.
- f. Eric Roe: I suggest we do a late August meeting after school starts.

12. Updated Schedule of Meetings and Adjournment

- a. Adjournment at 9:55 p.m.
- b. June 14, 2018: DPAC meeting (economic analysis, preparations for Public Charrette 2)
- c. July 10-14, 2018: Public Charrette 2
- d. August 16 or 23, 2018 (date to be determined): DPAC meeting (summary report on Public Charrette 2, preparation for a joint PC / CC meeting, next steps)
- e. September 11 or 18, 2018 (date to be determined): Joint PC / CC meeting

