



Meeting Minutes

City of Davis

**Downtown Davis Plan Advisory Committee Meeting at Mid-Point Stage
of the Participatory Design Workshop Event Being Held at
Davis Community Church Fellowship Hall, 412 C Street
Thursday, July 12, 2018
6:00 to 8:00 P.M.**

Committee Members: Meg Arnold (Chair), Michelle Byars (Vice Chair), Judy Corbett, Mary DeWall, Chris Granger, Larry Guenther, Darren McCaffrey, John Meyer, Sinisa Novakovic, Eric Roe, Deema Tamimi, Rob White, Randy Yackzan, Josh Chapman

Liaison Members: Eric Gudz (sitting for Ryan Dodge), Cheryl Essex, Justin Goss

Absent: Catherine Brinkley, Matt Dulcich, Rob Hofmann

City Staff: Bob Wolcott, Diane Parro, Heidi Tschudin

Consultants: Dan Parolek and Mitali Ganguly (Opticos Design), Nicole Porter and Taylor Coover (AIM), and Other Sub-Consultants

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 6:00 p.m.
- b. Meg welcomed the DPAC members.
- c. All committee members present except Catherine Brinkley, Matt Dulcich, and Rob Hofmann.

2. Approval of Agenda

- a. The agenda is approved by consensus.
- b. Mary and Michelle abstained due to absence from previous meeting.

3. Approval of Minutes

- a. The June 14, 2018 meeting minutes are approved.

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

- a. No announcements.

5. Working Set of Guiding Principles.

- a. Opticos presents the latest working set of Guiding Principles which reflect DPAC input from the first participatory design workshop. The consultant team will continue to accept input to inform the set of working guiding principles. Working guiding principles will have some flux throughout plan development, to reflect specifics of the plan.

b. Working Guiding Principles

- i. Create an active and inclusive public realm that promotes civic engagement.
- ii. Create a memorable identity by establishing downtown districts.
- iii. Reinforce a sense of place with appropriate character, balanced historical preservation objectives, and surrounding neighborhoods.
- iv. Provide safe, convenient multimodal connectivity into and within downtown.
- v. Craft a development program that is economically feasible.
- vi. Plan for compact and sustainable development.

c. **DPAC Comments**

- i. John Meyer: Given our broad discussion at the last meeting, I thought those working guiding principles were good. The only exception is the principle about the different districts; we may not need to mention them at a Guiding Principles level.
- ii. Chris Granger: I would echo that. Secondly, coming from a sustainability background, I have problem with the term “convenient” in Item #4 of the working Guiding Principles. Could we look for a different word?
- iii. Eric Roe: Will each district have a different form-based code?
- iv. Dan Parolek: Based upon the plan’s development thus far, it is likely that each district will have one or multiple form-based zoning districts.
- v. Eric Roe: I support the removal of Item #2 in the working Guiding Principles, about the different downtown districts. I believe it should be a subset underneath another principle.
- vi. Eric Roe: Will one area of downtown have different building height limits than other parts of downtown? Such as the center of downtown versus the far west part of downtown?
- vii. Dan Parolek: Yes, that is a likely outcome of the plan.
- viii. Eric Roe: The different districts should be kept, but they do not need to be one of the working guiding principles.

d. **Public Comment on the Working Set of Guiding Principles**

- i. Bonnie Mintun: What is the fourth principle?
- ii. Meg Arnold: Provide safe, convenient multimodal connectivity into and within downtown.
- iii. Bonnie Mintun: “Convenient” may not necessarily be a bad word to use, in terms of accessibility and those who need mobility assistance.
- iv. Meg Arnold: We can replace “convenient” with “inclusive.”

- v. Tia: I am a little concerned with the idea of removing the sub-districts. I do not understand how we can have transition areas without some idea of different sub-districts.
- vi. Meg Arnold: The current discussion is about whether the sub-districts warrant its own Guiding Principle. The sub-districts will not be removed from the plan.
- e. DPAC approves working set of Guiding Principles, and encourages the continuation of their evolution throughout the plan development.

6. Informal Presentation at Mid-Point of the Participatory Design Workshop and Questions / Comments.

- a. Dan Parolek of Opticos Design introduces the presentation and provides an update on the status of work.
- b. Greg Behrens of Fehr and Peers gives a presentation on Transportation and Street Network.
- c. Patrick Siegman of Siegman & Associates gives a presentation about Parking.
- d. Doug Farr of Farr Associates gives a presentation about Sustainability.
- e. Merrill Seidl of Lotus Water gives a presentation about Sustainable Infrastructure.
- f. Matt Kowta of BAE Economics gives a presentation about Economics Analysis.
- g. Dan Parolek of Opticos Design gives a presentation about Urban Design.
- h. **DPAC Comments**
 - i. Chris Granger: How many of the proposed street designs are curb-less?
 - ii. Greg Behrens: There are some curb-less options. For 3rd Street, we would want to provide a continuous corridor with the same look and feel as G Street, include a narrow roadway. If it was curb-less, bollards could be put up for events or festivals to allow for flexibility on how to use the space. For the roundabout concept, in some simulations it does not work very well; it can cause downstream congestion near the interchange and upstream near H Street. In many situations the roundabout concept is not feasible. There are operational issues with the offset intersection as well; this option could create a messier entrance to downtown than what is currently there today. The team's focus has been to retrofit the existing intersection to make it work.
 - iii. Chris Granger: Using current street configuration?
 - iv. Greg Behrens: Yes.
 - v. Chris Granger: Is there an affordable and equitable component to the sustainability discussion? Where are we with the economic analysis to include that type of information? Are they part of the scope of work, and if not how can it be included?
 - vi. Matt Kowta: It is a local jurisdiction's responsibility to build housing at high densities when appropriate. Looking for opportunities to appropriately increase the housing densities in Davis will be a key to making sites available for both market rate and affordable housing developers. Davis has close proximity to jobs, schools, services and shopping that are relatively easy to access by biking or walking; these are key components that can help a city obtain affordable housing funding.

The city is also looking for ways to reduce requirements for urban infill to make it more feasible to develop. By reducing parking requirements and converting per-unit fees to per-foot fees can encourage the development of smaller units at a lower cost.

- vii. Deema Tamimi: Water costs will start skyrocketing. If we can figure out how to use less water in our toilets, what will that save us? The same goes for houses that will not need anything from the grid anymore, as electricity prices are skyrocketing as well. How is that going to help operating costs in houses? Is there a way to calculate it?
- viii. Matt Kowta: There are some calculations that can be made. Your question points towards the need for a higher initial upfront investment in buildings efficient structures that save us over the long term. It's possible to do some calculations; I want to plant the seed - can we be wise in investments and lead to longer term cost savings to create a more sustainable downtown?
- ix. Darren McCaffrey: How do we incentivize all different players in the future implementation of whatever plan is codified, to make decisions for the long term? If you build a more efficient building that will cost more right now but serve your tenants and investors in the long run? As a developer you need to pay people back starting day 1 and sometimes into Year 5. Same with present and future Councilmembers; if looking to be reelected how do we incentivize them to initially put city in red but long term help us.
- x. Darren McCaffrey: What are range of options we could look at to make these things happen; e.g. going to business and property owners, helping them get on board with the plan we as a committee and Council gets behind? Those options may include elements no one wants, or are really easy that do not achieve anything? Are any of our options going to be reasonably done?
 - 1. Patrick Siegman: How do you get developers to build buildings with long term goals and make profit (addressing this); restructure all of your current impact fees so reflect impacts created instead of saying this if your fee per residential unit. That current approach does not work. Should create a fee based on all the effects the project has.
 - 2. Dan Parolek: More than anything they are good seeds to plant and to consider. May want to look to invest money to make these things happen. Find a way to bridge the gap between longstanding property owners in downtown Davis and the current residents and community. Need creative ways to get those owners to the table.
 - 3. Doug Farr: If we had strong partnership between community choice energy and PG&E to invest in a district system, a developer would not have to pay the capital expense system but instead be a part of an agreement that takes some of the load off the developer in exchange of an ongoing payment - that could be a way to increase the viability of that type of development.
- xi. Cheryl Essex: Is there any consideration by the team to look at building a plaza at the train station instead of at a smaller area? The train depot is

really iconic; the heart of where Davis started. We have historic structures there where could create a fantastic and unique plaza in that area. Busy in the mornings. Active park space to serve old East Davis and Olive Drive. Then anywhere in downtown you would be within 2 blocks of a park. I wouldn't recommend a public space by the station to take place of any of the other proposed public spaces. It could be in addition to the other proposed spaces. We would need to activate and program it.

i. Public Comments

- i. For the proposed Class IV protected bikeways, are they grade separated?
 1. Greg Behrens: Some of the proposed Class IV bikeways would be in the roadway; we would not recommend providing fully separated bicycle facilities throughout the whole grid. One potential recommendation is a grade separated facility that connects to the arboretum, generally near G Street.
- ii. Could you please discuss the nature of protection the team is proposing to offer for Class IV bicycle facilities?
 1. Greg Behrens: These Class IV facilities would feature some type of horizontal separation with a buffer, 3 feet for door zone when parallel to parking. Planters would also work appropriately.
- iii. I commend the other strategies, especially the subsidized bus pass system in downtown. I echo enthusiasm from Jeff; we talked to downtown business association and chamber, there is buy-in for that idea here. Seriously consider it; talking about remote parking for employees to take spots at edge of town instead of core downtown, that system would help.
- iv. We need a parking space sign coming out of the tunnel; are there any thoughts about putting it on the other side of the underpass? If on other side, one could look at it while sitting at the light, as opposed to when trying to go through the underpass.

7. Committee Discussion of the Mid-Point Presentation and the Design Charrette

a. DPAC Comments

i. Public Square

1. I prefer the E street plaza (1st alternative) because the city already has control of that land. Sometimes when too many people (2nd alternative) try to work together, it doesn't work.
2. John Meyer: To get through movement to F Street, that makes a huge difference. I don't like the features on 3rd street (alt 4). Alt. 1 is deliverable and controllable. I get the idea on 3rd street but so many steps to it.
3. Eric Roe: Look at option 1 and option 4. The way I envision it is Alt 1 is stage one that could lead to option four. Setting our sights on what to do with Downtown Plan, we can set sights on #4 and start with #1. But I am deeply concerned if we only choose #1, that will show the town we are working towards. If adopt first plan that only addresses one step to several steps the city could eventually progress to.

4. I suggest we go with first plaza design #1. It would be easier to purchase two adjacent properties and turn them into a rectangular and more open space.
 - a. Dan Parolek: Our biggest concern with this option is that you get hidden retail in the center of that space. Even now with parking lot, the shopfronts in the middle of that, the businesses turn over more there than the businesses on the street. If we can encourage a pedestrian passage to the plaza, it would help remedy that.
 5. Michelle Byars: I'm excited about #1 and to an extent #4. I like the first one because we have all of these small businesses that would benefit from an urban plaza activating the area. Could also bring some play space and bring the space alive for kids. It could bring people in from N/S. It was recently designed with a stage for a studio class, putting a stage where actors facing west in afternoon would be a bad idea.
 - a. Dan Parolek: The only difference between 1 and 4 is additional plaza space that could have expanded past the other buildings.
 6. Darren McCaffrey: I like the small/medium/large idea in #1. I would like for there to be a new public plaza at the depot and central park. It would help connect the space between those public spaces whether done by landscaping, street trees, signage, or whatever it is to give people a sense that there is a greenbelt.
- ii. Economic engine
1. Justin Goss: With no new revenues coming, two options are economic development and containment. I'm interested in how policy decisions interact with BAE's feasibility study. We need to consider how to allow for more residential development downtown, boost the city's property base tax downtown, and create ready-made stream to boost city's sales tax.
 2. Meg Arnold: Interior facing retail and small businesses that are local could be better activated and create more sales tax revenue.
 3. Rob White: The drawings are beautiful, and the plans are great; if you build something no one comes to it will not work. We haven't yet figured out who is going to go into these spaces. If you do a bunch of redevelopment, who's going to go there especially with higher rates? We shouldn't build something we can afford. I suggest we conduct a psychographic study and understand what are kind of shops we want. Some are current businesses, and some are new. San Luis Obispo has a mix of credit tenants, eateries, small feel but active spaces. Do the study and then we will know who our downtown can support. More likely to sign leases for those types of businesses.
 4. John Meyer: The essence of project is to be successful; give everyone certainty of what's allowed. We need something that gets general agreement and excitement about what's allowed. That

- brings more benefit than a plaza or anything else. We need level of certainty that removes risk.
5. My friends with kids only come to downtown for the Christmas lighting and parades and that's it. Downtown needs to be more amenable to families with kids; families with kids have more money than college students and poor people. We need to make sure city council knows to emphasize a code that promotes more and smaller units is better.
 6. Chris Granger: We have a lot of public employees that commute to Sacramento. California has GHG goals that need to reduce. We are currently partnering with state to anchor public employee tenants.
 7. Meg Arnold: Senator Pan is trying to push a bill through that asks the state do some type of GHG study on its base of employees; the outcomes could help drive behavioral changes at the state.
 8. Randy Yackzan: The university next door has \$2 billion worth of plans for an Aggie Square; new chancellor made decision with Mayor Steinberg. If we can find out what they want and what they planned, maybe we can get 10% of that \$2 billion. It would be great to have workers downtown. Retail is struggling but if have a credit tenant, the university could do that and industries that work with them. Part of the economic generator would be working with university to see what we can bring downtown.
 9. Josh Chapman: Regarding sustainability in relation to economic development – it's difficult to pile it onto one project. If it can plug into something to help share, that would help the whole thing move along. Not every project has to fully load itself, but rather share itself with the downtown community
 10. Justin Goss: Finance and Budget Commission opinion is that there's not enough discussion with us and UCD – they are building a new research center in Sacramento. We need to see what preferences developers would like. We should be trying to create conditions that are feasible for more tenants downtown.
 11. Rob White: We have a long history of discouraging the university. What we haven't done that Sacramento has done is lean into this; they cleared the way and did studies. Mayor Steinberg is out showing off this project. The opportunity is there - they are looking for that engagement, but we have to be a trusted partner as well. We need to be clear with ourselves; the reason big companies go other places is track record.
 12. Deema Tamimi: We have a great agriculture and food tech university – we could be center of clean tech. I'd love to see that be an economic driver for us. If we are going to make sustainable practices our policy, it would go well with clean tech. On the policy side, let's talk about the ordinances on the banks. We have a lot of banks and I don't see a lot of employees; I don't know if they bring a lot of people in; are we getting a lot from that?

- a. Dan Parolek: We have tried to engage the banks with zero success. If there's a way for the city to prioritize opening a dialogue with those banks, that would be good. We should engage with leadership within the banks.
- b. Public Comment
 - i. Rhonda Reed: I second the comment with respect to the bank properties. We all visit them, maybe we talk to the managers there to start discussion about how they can use their land differently, more effectively.
 - ii. Rhonda Reed: One of the buildings on E Street plaza tenants is the Army Corps of Engineers; the likelihood of changing that while they are a tenant (10-18 more years) is not very realistic. In the plan, can we have something to work towards immediately, but keep multiple options as a gestalt of potential other ideas and options.
 - iii. Robin K. I am interested in opportunities of the public plaza. If we are going to take away parking, won't that cause resistance?
 1. Patrick Siegman: Yes, one of the positive outcomes of creating a great space is that people are willing to walk an extra block or two to get there. We need to create a management framework to better manage parking you have, including the pricing. Go talk to all the downtown merchants and say, when we get \$.5 – 1.5 million in parking revenue, what is your top priority for using that? Once we have management in place, we can look at if we need to replace surface parking with something somewhere else, perhaps the edge of downtown? Or do what Boulder, Colorado did - get 1,000 employees to move to transit and make it free.
 - iv. Steve Greenfield: The greywater use makes a lot of sense, but I would caution thinking too much of storm water reuse because we get such a short period of time where we get enough water to use, so it would be better to put it back into the ground. Perhaps through a rain garden. If we only get storm water during 3 weeks in a year, we can use all that water captured in April/May.
 - v. Steve Greenfield: On another topic, regarding banks - I thought it was policy to have a downtown branch. Don't need to blame them for not engaging in the plan, but maybe talk with them about how they use their space.
 1. Meg: Deena's comment did address the idea of changing the ordinance to make it not so onerous or not existing at all.
 - vi. Grant: I'm a retired developer. I see the university, I see the banks, the Brinley Group - we may need a lobbying division of this group, maybe from Council. Those are 3 potential huge economic generators for us. But this process isn't set up to pursue this. It may need to come from the Council. We've abused the university, Rob is right, but we're neighbors. Its tremendous bureaucracy but they're huge and they're growing.
 - vii. Randy Yackzan: May need a lobbying a lobbying group. Won't do eminent domain with redevelopment.

- viii. Rob White: What about the policy on banks, can we just make a recommendation to the staff to explain why the ordinance exists? And then to remove it?
- ix. Chris Granger: If up zoning, we need to see public benefits from them not just private benefits.

x. University Rice Lane

1. DPAC Comments

- a. Sinisia Novakovic: Where is this coming from? A couple developers have been pushing for it for a while. I want to know what we can do on every block on University and Rice.
- b. Chris Granger: There is confusion because most people do not know the history. On the current maps and planning for the Downtown, there are subunits, but University/Rice is not treated as an area that will have a form-based code attached to it. Most of this is about communication. Need information on the existing zoning. There is a framework already in place that will be translated into a form-based code for University and Rice. I think people are looking at the map and saying look at that part.
- c. Darren McCaffrey: My experience with the neighborhood is traveling along 3rd coming from west Davis into downtown. It already has a commercial character to it. It allows it to develop in the same way, connecting part of 3rd street across B Street. So the connection of the downtown core area to other parts of community would see gradation that is consistent. Current developments along 3rd street make sense.
- d. Josh Chapman: It is the neighborhood vision – any further move to densify that area would be a distraction. It would be detrimental to our efforts and take away from our other focuses for downtown.
- e. Deema Tamimi: Going through that neighborhood it is all over the place, so I don't know how you give it a form-based code. Maybe rethink boundaries of form-based code; not sure how to deal with it.
- f. Judy Corbett: My understanding of the question is that we are going to have form-based code, should it be going up or keep it as originally planned? That is the question. I agree with Josh, this would be a distraction.

2. Public comment

- a. Sarah Worley: 3rd street and B Street were subject to another additional zoning process which allows redevelopment commercial development on 3rd to continue commercial and pedestrian which can include up to 4

stories in some incidents. Would have an advantage to have a form-based code there. Issue is the same. When looking at change, what do you mean? Different from the remainder of more residential portions, those two corridors have been changed.

- b. Meg Arnold: In sum, the will of the group is that current nature of University Avenue/Rice Lane not be significantly changed.

8. Public Comments on Items Not on Agenda

- a. None

9. Other Committee and Staff Communications

- a. Summary Report of the Visual Preference Survey conducted at the June 14, 2018 DPAC meeting.
- b. DPAC Comments
 - i. Meg Arnold: The document is available on the website.
 - ii. Bob Wolcott: Judy's VPS is a good starting point as we delve into specific plan and form-based code.

10. Next DPAC Meeting Date and Adjournment

- a. The meeting adjourns 8:40 pm.
 - b. The next DPAC meeting is scheduled for 2:30 PM on Saturday, July 14, 2018 following the Participatory Design Workshop closing presentation / open house at the Davis Community Church Fellowship Hall, 412 C Street.
-