



Meeting Minutes

City of Davis

Downtown Davis Plan Advisory Committee Meeting

Senior Center Activity Room, 646 A Street

Thursday, August 9, 2018

7:00 P.M.

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

Liaison Members: Ryan Dodge, Cheryl Essex, Justin Goss, Rob Hofmann

Absent: Matt Dulcich, Eric Roe, Deema Tamimi

City Council Liaisons: Brett Lee, Dan Carson (absent)

City Staff: Bob Wolcott, Diane Parro, Heidi Tschudin

Consultants: Mitali Ganguly and Caroline (Opticos Design), Isabelle Gaillard and Taylor Coover (AIM), Matt Kowta (BAE Urban Economics), Greg Behrens (Fehr and Peers)

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 7:05 pm.
- b. Meg welcomed the DPAC members.
- c. All committee members present except Matt Dulcich, Eric Roe, Deema Tamimi.

2. Approval of Agenda

- a. The agenda is approved by consensus.

3. Approval of Minutes

- a. Bob noted that Rob Hoffman was present. The Chair asks the Committee to approve the draft minutes of July 12 and July 14.
 - b. Cheryl Essex requested edits to the meeting minutes. Cheryl gets clarification on comment made by Dan Parolek regarding Rice Lane.
 - i. Opticos will start with existing zoning for Rice Lane, but unlikely to make many changes. This does not need to be a future specific topic to discuss at a future DPAC meeting.
 - ii. Chris Granger asks the DPAC members to go through the July 14 meeting minutes and provide context to all comments made if needed.
 - c. The draft minutes from July 12 are approved by consensus. July 14 meeting minutes are postponed to next meeting.
- 4. Brief Announcements from Chair, Committee Members, Staff or Consultants**
- a. There are no brief announcements.
- 5. Information on Planning for Disabilities**
- a. Bonnie Mintun gives presentation on universal design and inclusive design.
 - b. DPAC Comments:
 - i. Cheryl Essex: Thank you, Bonnie. I am a landscape architect and I agree with you. ADA and Title 24 are insufficient to integrate accessibility into our city scape. I appreciate that and I think this is something this committee should seriously consider.
 - ii. Gloria Partida: Thank you, Bonnie. Yes, the guidelines don't always function the way they should. With landscape design, often things are planted too close to the sidewalks and the streets and architects sometimes do not take into account that bushes grow and it can become an inaccessible space. My son has to go all the way back and around because he has come across a bush that has grown over the sidewalk.
 - iii. Catherine Brinkley: Thank you for the work you have done in our schools. Some of my son's best friends are in wheelchairs and that wouldn't be the case if you had not paved the way for Davis and made our schools accessible for students.
 - iv. Michelle Byars: As a citizen, I look forward to having an ADA liaison at the City.
 - v. Larry Guenther: How do we integrate this into the work? Do we make a motion to add universal design to the criteria?
 - vi. Meg Arnold: It seem likes we can provide consultants with a general direction – we can say this is a priority to us.
 - vii. Greg Behrens: There are a lot of jurisdictions that will adopt these guidelines that address these specific issues. One common document is the proposed guidelines for pedestrian facilities and public right of way, the PROWAG guidelines. They haven't been formally adopted by FHWA, but recognized as best practices on roadways and that is something we can formalize in the specific plan. The level of design is not something we can achieve with this design, but if we adopt it as a guideline for design for roadways, then a lot of those principals can be incorporated.

- viii. John Meyer: Public space is simplest to change, it's really private design that will be hard to incorporate.
 - ix. Bonnie Mintun: I think this hasn't happened because the contradiction between new urban design and universal design. Davis likes challenge – let's have at it. It is possible.
 - x. Larry Guenther: Should we propose a resolution that the DPAC would like universal design to be emphasized into the plan?
 - xi. Meg Arnold: Perhaps we can provide direction to the consultants – that we want this integrated in the work that is underway.
 - xii. Mitali Ganguly: We have worked on an outline that is already submitted to the City. Universal Design is included in the document, but we need to think about who handles the implementation before adding it as a principal – We don't want to create a plan that that cannot be realized. It needs more thought as we were planning to include Universal Design in the document in any case.
 - xiii. Bonnie Mintun: Having in the document is a good start.
 - xiv. Michelle Byars: We discussed sustainability a few meetings ago. It was included as a guiding principal. Is this the same?
 - xv. Mitali Ganguly: Inclusivity is currently in the guiding principles. We can emphasize it.
 - xvi. Meg Arnold: DPAC recommendation: The DPAC would like to emphasize the importance of the full range of inclusiveness as expressed in the principal and throughout the document, particularly Universal Design – that it be appropriately embedded throughout the Specific Plan.
 - xvii. Michelle Byars: I'd like to add that we also use appropriate language – age friendly and the experienced class.
 - xviii. Motion passes.
- c. Public Comments:
- i. Belle Noble: I think there are many Davis citizens who connect with this need for access. I will be 75 this year, and I will get less mobile. I am interested in downtown being more accessible. I've lived in Davis for 50 years now, I have no plans to move and I still want to be able to participate in downtown.
 - ii. Mike Hart: Would it be possible at the next meeting for me to make a presentation at the next meeting to explain what I have in mind for transportation?
 - iii. John Meyer: Can we get something in writing first?
 - iv. Mike Hart: Yes, I am happy to.

6. Follow-up Questions on Street Design Concepts

- a. Greg Behrens of Fehr and Peers responds to follow-up questions from the Participatory Design Workshop #2.
- b. DPAC Comments:
 - i. Larry Guenther: I would like more specifics on how people bike downtown – specifically the edge treatments and connecting to downtown and also specifically Richards, B Street, F Street.

- ii. Greg Behrens: We are looking at improvements in all the gateways surrounding the downtown – specifically 1st and Richards – when coming into downtown, as you’re coming out of Davis Commons and the tunnel on the shared path, you emerge at 1st Street on the wrong side of the street as you’re trying to bike into downtown. One option is to convert E Street into a one-way street and one of the travel lanes into a two-lane cycle track on the west side of the street, which would go a block or two north into the heart of downtown on 2nd or 3rd Street. The second option is to reconstruct the southern curb line at that intersection. You could create a bike staging area similar to what you have at Sycamore and install a separate bike-signal phase and then also providing protected bike lanes to get people into downtown. On the 5th street corridor, we are looking at traffic calming strategies to reduce speeds of vehicles and improve visibility of cyclists on 5th Street. At second and B, we are looking at installing traffic signals there for both bicyclists and pedestrians. Another location to improve is at the Depot, include the interface between all modes getting in and out of the parking lot. Also, looking at B and 5th street to work more efficiently.
- iii. Darren McCaffrey: At the Davis Commons, what is the intent currently, if you were biking and want to do north into the city, how are you supposed to get there? Is there a consideration to do a light where pedestrians cross at all directions?
- iv. Greg Behrens: You are supposed to walk your bike through the Commons. Yes, we have considered the “scramble” crosswalk at 1st and E where pedestrians can cross at all directions.
- v. Josh Chapman: When you talk about traffic calming at 5th street and one ways on E. What traffic calming streets are you considering? How is public safety being included?
- vi. Greg Behrens: They said they wouldn’t have objections to driving contra-flow for a one or two 20-foot stretch. They would need clearance. On 5th Street, we wouldn’t look at doing speed bumps. It would instead be a bulb out.
- vii. John Meyer: On 5th Street, that safe harbor would help people get across. D Street is a good way to get off if people are not comfortable on 5th Street. Please also consider that flashing yellow light outside the fire station. It doesn’t seem to serve the purpose that was intended.
- viii. Michelle Byars: 3rd street is my main way to get in town by bike. When it’s shared, that is why it doesn’t feel comfortable.
- ix. Greg Behrens: Shared street doesn’t mean all modes, but rather narrowed. It serves to reduce speed and volume of cars.
- x. Catherine Brinkley: When in Copenhagen, we noticed the streets had different colors and textures which helps differentiate between bike lanes, streets and sidewalks. Also, they time the traffic lights for bike speeds, not car speeds.
- xi. Greg Behrens: Yes, our designs are inspired by some of those facilities.
- xii. Cheryl Essex: Do you have a strategy for A Street?

- xiii. Greg Behrens: There's an opportunity to do something with the extra right of way on A Street. My understanding is that the University is looking at improving those facilities. We can take a closer look at this street.
 - xiv. Meg Arnold: Is there desire from the group for Greg to look at northbound and southbound A Street more?
 - xv. Chris Granger: A Street north of Russell is wide and B Street is narrow, which provides an interesting challenge in getting good bike access.
 - xvi. Larry Guenther: Is this something that should be subbed out to Bike Safety Transportation Commission? I make a motion that we request this goes out to the Bike Safety Transportation Commission.
 - xvii. Meg Arnold: What I hear from the consultant is that this is not necessarily the most important part of your scope of work? Is the group interested enough about the question of northbound and southbound on A Street, that we ask the consultants to research it further?
 - xviii. Michelle Byars: I would like to say yes. Crossing at A street, there are a lot of bikes and significant number of people that use it as a thoroughfare.
 - xix. Catherine Brinkley: There are a lot of bikes, but I don't perceive a problem.
 - xx. Sinisa Novakovick: It's pretty good as it is. The bike path on campus is a legal bike and pedestrian path that goes from 5th Street to 1st Street. Usually people just get on the sidewalk and cross on the sidewalk. Why make another bike path?
 - xxi. Greg Behrens: One thing to consider is the conversion of having southbound A Street is that the majority of traffic desiring to get to Richards would choose A Street to do that. There would be substantial shifting of traffic patterns compared to what you see today. That would require a detailed study to understand how roadways are designed to accommodate that.
 - xxii. Meg Arnold: Is there a motion?
 - xxiii. John Meyer: No.
 - xxiv. Meg Arnold: Greg, perhaps look into how to fine-tune A Street travel.
 - xxv. Rob White: We should think hard about getting in the Seattle example shown from the presentation. I make a serious recommendation to think hard about this example for three reasons. We have early morning deliveries and multiple uses throughout the day. Flat surfaces make it more interesting for universal design. The more multi-use our streets feel, people think it's made for them. We want to be the living lab. Street striping might be a good place to start.
 - xxvi. Greg Behrens: This is what we were thinking for 3rd Street.
 - xxvii. Chris Granger: I think I'm hearing; can we consider this for other places besides 3rd Street? Like around the whole E Street Plaza area as well.
- c. Public Comment:
- i. Tia: I'm an Old East Davis resident. In the discussion, I haven't heard much about the streets from L Street into downtown and from J Street and 3rd Street, and 3rd Street and K Street. There are a lot of collisions in that area. Should this concern go to the Bicycle Safety Commission? I'm not sure if Old East Davis is going to be considered in the plan.

- ii. Meg Arnold: The eastern boundary of the planning area is G Street, but thank you for bringing it up.

7. Follow-up Information on Economic Analysis Including Feasibility

- a. Matt Kowta of BAE presents updated information on economic feasibility and financial modeling.
- b. DPAC Comments:
 - i. Catherine Brinkley: Is the database where the jobs are located?
 - ii. Matt Kowta: Yes, this is the location of the establishments in where the jobs are located.
 - iii. Gloria Partida: Are these jobs associated with the UC Davis?
 - iv. Matt Kowta: The jobs are physically located within the City of Davis, not directly associated with the university.
 - v. Meg Arnold: Even if it is a university collaboration that happens to be in the City of Davis?
 - vi. Matt Kowta: It's possible, but after looking through the records, I did not notice UC Davis employer identification.
 - vii. Chris Granger: Does this mean all government jobs are not in here? I don't see the Agricultural sector in there.
 - viii. Matt Kowta: One of these sectors, transportation and warehousing, does include the post office. These were the ones that had higher wages and were showing growth as well. It depends on how an individual location is characterized.
 - ix. Chris Granger: This looks back in time, and we are looking forward with our plan.
 - x. Matt Kowta: No, we are not trying to predict future growth. What we are seeing is that in terms of our community profile, growth in these kinds of sectors is consistent with our assets in Davis, with high end manufacturing businesses. In manufacturing, it comes with high value and high education requirements. These are the kinds of sectors that are compatible with our work force. These are likely to grow.
 - xi. Ryan Dodge: What is the data source?
 - xii. Matt Kowta: California Employment Development Department's Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages Establishment Data.
 - xiii. Justin Goss: I think the committee should explore the recommendation on feasibility analysis to ease or eliminate the parking requirements. I didn't see that as one of the potential strategies.
 - xiv. Matt Kowta: I hope I broadly captured in terms of reducing requirements for parking. There are other types of physical requirements, which would be a great incentive. Parking is such an expensive component of these projects, \$50,000 per space in some cases. It would be a benefit if you could provide a lower ratio of parking. For example, one of the downtown developers mentioned that moving to one space per unit was indeed a marketable type of approach.
 - xv. Meg Arnold: One of the parking strategies recommended was to ease it and change requirements.
 - xvi. Mitali Ganguly: This will include no minimum parking ratios.

- xvii. Justin Goss: I would be curious to see in the feasibility analysis of how different types of developments go from red to green in those areas.
- xviii. Matt Kowta: We did incorporate minimal parking in the prototypes that we analyzed and tried to get aggressive scenario. Our small lot project had zero parking, limited amount of parking for the medium sized prototypes. We could potentially go further with that. We only looked at a few prototypes and thought about if we could change the unit sizes and we found we could push a few prototypes above the feasibility threshold, which makes it close enough to the point where dropping more parking could make a difference. The message should not be lost. It's not that these things will never be feasible, there are current challenges and could be figured out with the right tenant and configuration.
- xix. Rob White: One of things the community discussed, owner occupied development with three to five units on a single lot. It is a different driver, you would not have to deal with some of the regular development costs. There needs to be some level of teaching people to find finances for their homes, much like an owner-occupied business.
- xx. Matt Kowta: In an owner-occupied scenario the economic calculation is much different than talking about residential projects that will be serving higher income people. However, it could be a possible component.
- xxi. Judy Corbett: How small in unit size did you go and what difference can that make?
- xxii. Matt Kowta: We had about 800 square feet units, which are not small. Micro units can work, with a much lower overall price that does not work for all people. One issue is when you have a fee structure that is tied to unit instead of the square footage, it that will discourage smaller units, especially with density units. Currently, there seems to be an incentive to maximize the units to deflate costs.
- xxiii. Darren McCafferty: Is that because you are charged per unit as a developer?
- xxiv. Matt Kowta: Yes, for certain things, including impact fees, parking and affordable housing.
- c. Public Comments:
 - i. Cathy Forkas: It's depressing to read the feasible and not feasible options. And that when you introduce low-income housing, it's less feasible. Where can the money for affordable housing come from, is it through grants?
 - ii. Matt Kowta: Yes, it's through grants. There are funds out there. They are way less than the real need. I spoke to the City's affordable housing consultant. I shared information and recommendations with Mitali and Dan on what can help with affordable housing. There are things that can be done that will make downtown attractive for affordable housing, like streamlining the entitlement process and creating a plan that clearly identifies what projects are desired and how to reach approval on those projects. The current system favors stand-alone affordable housing.

- iii. Bob Wolcott: Council will be revisiting the affordable housing ordinance by the end of the year. Asking that Matt develops the affordable housing strategies further in specific plan.
- iv. Matt Kowta: The density bonus program also encouraged mixed incoming housing and it is a state requirement that jurisdictions allow increase in density for projects that provide certain percentages of lower income housing. This provides an incentive for developers on how many units they can have on a given parcel.
- v. Richard McCann: The EDD data was very interesting and struck by the growth rate in the peripheral areas was higher than the downtown area, which shows a missing opportunity in being able to combine people with similar economic interests. Specifically, 2nd and D street with the real estate offices, and banks within walking distance of each other. We should focus on how you get people back into downtown to meet up and strengthen the downtown businesses.

8. **Virtual Community Workshop Summary.**

- a. Opticos and / or AIM briefly summarize the Virtual Workshop Summary.
- b. DPAC Comments:
 - i. John Meyer: Was there any variance from the other workshop?
 - ii. Mitali Ganguly: The summary speaks for itself.
 - iii. Meg Arnold: Were the responses from the virtual workshop generally in line with the design workshops?
 - iv. Diane Parro: The responses received on the online workshop was not dramatically different from the first Participatory Design Workshop. There are some extremes, such as some say absolutely more parking, and some say no more parking and we need more bicycles. It is not uniform, but it is consistent with what we've seen.
 - v. Mitali Ganguly: In the virtual community workshop, we tried to be more specific with the questions. First with the initial approach with the pop-up workshops, we were broader and more generic with our questions. The virtual community workshop was more specific to guide our work and use it as a point of reference.
- c. Public Comments:
 - i. Richard McCann: Are the slides available online?
 - ii. Isabelle Gaillard: The full compilation of feedback is on the resource section of website.

9. **Participatory Design Workshop #2 Summary Report and Discussion of Key Concepts**

- a. Opticos summarizes the PDW #2 Summary Report and Summary of Feedback.
- b. Committee comments:
 - i. Meg Arnold: The E Street preference seemed pretty clear from the July workshop, any comments on guiding principles for the aspects of a working draft? We had guidance to incorporate universal design into guiding principles.
 - ii. John Meyer: Universal design in terms of inclusion and accessibility.

- iii. Larry Guenther: Sustainability is only with development, it seems that it should be more inclusive for city services in terms of water, power and food.
- iv. Meg Arnold: Something along the lines of compact development with multiple aspects of sustainability. This reference to sustainable development seems narrower than the broad triple bottom line slide.
- v. Mitali Ganguly: We do want sustainability to be overarching theme of the entire specific plan and we will try to incorporate into existing scope with strategies and policies. Can we actually incorporate the metrics? No, not currently. We want to get a better sense of the depth the committee is looking for when including sustainability.
- vi. Catherine Brinkley: We can't do sustainability and low carbon futures if we are not talking about our energy system. I don't see anything about district heating and cooling as that is a huge opportunity for our downtown density. By updating district heating and cooling facilities, it saves energy. downtown has density, converting facilities, Copenhagen has new waste energy facility with ski slope and climbing wall, not waste energy, but could focus on district energy and concrete goals.
- vii. Mitali Ganguly: I agree. However, we wanted our principals to be substantial in document. There are still exploring the best approach for the scope and direction. We can mention sustainability as a principal.
- viii. Chris Granger: The most recent workshop provided ideas and information about sustainability. I wonder how is Opticos going to create framework that will be used in the plan?
- ix. Mitali Ganguly: The work Chris is referring to is the matrix of different goals and objectives around building levels, transit and infrastructure. We need to develop further to make a working document. We would welcome some direction from the committee.
- x. Meg Arnold: My recollection was the need for a small informal focused group. If there were a group that might wish to help drive this work forward.
- xi. Chris Granger: There are many overarching goals that need to be clearly stated, and how will the goals be delivered?
- xii. Darren McCaffrey: How do you put sustainability into a form based-code? You don't want to throw in a setback.
- xiii. John Meyer: I get your point about metrics, but I'm not sure how you do metrics for memorable identity. We should strive to be a model of sustainable development and set a bar that is forward thinking.
- xiv. Mitali Ganguly: We can set broad goals for building sustainability and performance metrics. The differentiation is that we do not have resources to do the in-depth level of analysis that we would have liked to. This includes coming up with performance metrics. I would like to avoid any misunderstanding and be up front as we are still formalizing the structure of the specific plan.
- xv. Rob White: We should be removing policy barriers that doesn't allow implementation of things that we want. We've discussed per door charges, which will not support micro units. The opportunity to do these things

financially is to clean out the policy clutter, which will allow people to be more inventive and come in with ideas, such as districting. It is a big issue in our community and elsewhere.

- xvi. Larry Guenther: Would you change guiding principle #4 to enable development?
- xvii. Michelle Byars: How about to encourage existing development?
- xviii. Meg Arnold: I don't think we need a motion on enable versus encourage.
- xix. Chris Granger: I believe I asked to remove the word convenient from the guiding principles.
- xx. Meg Arnold: Thoughts on innovation district?
- xxi. Randy Yackzan: There are concerns about innovation district as I believe it is the first discussion we are having about it. Something we've heard a lot is to develop and innovate and I want to know more about it. Is it something that will allow more flexibility in residential, office or retail?
- xxii. Mitali Ganguly: Yes, that is the whole purpose. What I interpreted was that it promoted an office incubator type district with mixed use. We meant an area that will remain flexible and we do not want that approach for all of downtown. We want a refined vision for most of downtown that might possibly mean extra review. We need to fine tune what policies goes into it and at this stage, it is simply to allow policy to happen more easily, specifically flexibility in land use.
- xxiii. Justin Goss: I'm not sure how the idea of an innovation district is applicable to downtown Davis, other than the fact that we are a university town. The scale of the cities and their innovation districts, used as examples in the presentation, are larger than Davis downtown. What the large cities are proposing is large scale office development, an efficient transportation network from the University to the development and large amounts of public money to drive it.
- xxiv. Meg Arnold: As someone who has done work in innovation economy, the innovation district idea is more about retaining flexibility and what happens with space instead of creating "innovation districts" with incubators and accelerators. We possibly need a different word other than "innovation".
- xxv. Mitali Ganguly: We are trying take attributes of big cities and implement to promote investment in downtown and include in aspects of the specific plan. We are trying to promote all modes of transportation, such as transit. We are looking at a mixed used downtown and the residential component will be included as well. We are creating the scenario and create an economic generator with the University being nearby. It is more of a strategy to try and create an area for an attractive investment.
- xxvi. Larry Guenther: The idea to make an industrial view of the G Street corridor is a great.
- xxvii. Darren McCaffrey: There are a lot of one-story buildings on G Street are underutilizing the spaces they are currently on. Potentially, the lots on G between 3rd and 4th could be combined with a big building, so having a more flexible form-based code for that area could benefit the community.

- We need to look at this plan as more of a community instead of individual stakeholders. We need to fully explore the options for the good of the city.
- xxviii. Chris Granger: The districts can have different forms and when we are talking about the district over the railroad tracks, are you looking at a different form for the space that is on the east side of the railroad tracks?
 - xxix. Mitali Ganguly: Right now, we have not looked at it in detail. Yes, one of the key things to address is the transition to the boundaries, but we cannot have abrupt edges to downtown, it must be gradual transition.
 - xxx. Cheryl Essex: With the innovation district and idea of flexibility and sub-districts, are they different in mass and scale, different in design, land use or in parking ratios?
 - xxxi. Mitali Ganguly: There is a heat map graph for downtown, where we began looking at different parts of town and where it makes sense to have different types of buildings such as small, medium and large buildings. Also, looking at the relationship between the building and the sidewalk and the width of sidewalk will all be included in the heat map. For example, we want to avoid ruining residential character in that district if a large building were to be built in the district.

c. Public comments:

- i. Shawn Johnston: The area north of 5th street seemed very ill-defined and it needs more effort. With regards to the innovation district, realize there is a history with ambition taskforce and other groups. When you bring this to the natural resources board will change guiding principle #4 from plan to require and they will feel strongly about that. In the process, the review goes from planning to city, but does not include other commissions.
- ii. Ana McCann: The sustainable theme needs food, as we have the top food and agriculture university in the world. We have Sacramento and Woodland focusing on farm to fork. We have tech and innovation as the future of food and businesses are looking to locate near similar industries and it seems like this would be a great package and incentive. The businesses could be in one area of town or several areas, which would be great sell for tourism.
- iii. Richard McCann: The focus group would like the sustainability summary to be delivered to us. The core focus group was citizen run and worked with the consultants and carried it through. A link should be provided to the focus group with the summary. On compact development there needs to be a plan for sustainable infrastructure and activities.
- iv. Tia: There is no reference to health. Health and all policy is something that the county will consider and I hope health will not be totally neglected in this process.

10. Follow-up Information, Discussions and Possible Actions Pursuant to Participatory Design Workshop #2

- a. Request for information related to how City Commissions are involved in the Downtown Plan process.
 - a. DPAC Comments:

- i. Bob Wolcott: The city council laid out directions with key stages and a preferred plan with key milestones. On August 22, there is a Planning Commission meeting and the City Manager invited all City commissions and several downtown organizations to attend meeting to listen, make comments and report back to their groups to develop comments to be considered in the plan.
 - ii. John Meyer: For organizations in Old East and Old North Davis, I worry that they will feel that this is the first time they've been engaged with the plan and asked to provide comments. Also, other groups without representatives may feel like they are being excluded. It seems to give council more comfort, we should have allowed these groups to come share ideas at a meeting instead of a at the council meeting when they are first being included. Invite them to council for the full briefing and then invite them to comment at the next committee meeting or two.
 - iii. Meg Arnold: This is the process that city council has set up.
 - iv. Darren McCaffrey: Should we extend a formal invitation? Possibly in smaller groups and meet with them?
 - v. Cheryl Essex: Input from historical resources commission is important.
 - vi. Chris Granger: I think part of this is about timing and some commissions don't meet in summer.
 - vii. Meg Arnold: If council would like to receive feedback from the organizations, they will request it.
 - viii. Heidi Tschudin: I don't think they would necessarily comment on feedback collectively as a commission, collectively as a commission. More direction will be helpful, to specifically put it on an agenda.
 - ix. Chris Granger: I would like to suggest that this issue is related to bigger question of how to step out of box and ways laid out by council. I would suggest feedback sessions and delineate as a group and tell council about these things. We do not have permission from the council to do this. There are other issues, such as new boundaries for the downtown plan and the council will decide if they want to change the boundaries or not.
- b. Public Comments:
- i. John Johnston: As the chair of the Natural Resources Commission, the memo from the City Manager does not provide a fair hearing due to lack of understanding and information. I am not sure my concerns are the same of the group. My issue is if there will be an authority at the meeting answering questions.
 - ii. Richard McCann: I am on utility rates advisory commission and there is reluctance to act on items that aren't directed to them from council. They would like something formal to come to them to give comment on the specific plan.
 - iii. Diane Parro: The proposal has become action items that was a response from a request. People requested for commissions to

participate more and the opportunity we can present them with is to see the consultants present their presentation. There will be a question and answer forum. It will be the responsibility of the commission to tell project team about comments and requests.

- b. Zoning ordinance requirement that a bank in a neighborhood center zone must be a satellite of an existing facility in the core area.
 - a. DPAC Comments:
 - iv. Bob Wolcott: It would come up when a list of action items emerge with the specific plan. The zoning issues comes up in the neighborhood zoning districts and can only do it with a conditional use permit.
 - v. Rob White: It seems to me in the near future, we should have a list of 8-10 items for council that uncouple policies that no longer meet the objectives.
 - vi. Michelle Byars: I want to acknowledge Cheryl's question of, shouldn't core banks be downtown? The market would determine if banks should be downtown.
 - vii. Cheryl Essex: We could let market settle it. The biggest issue is lifting parking requirements with more incentive for redevelopment to incorporate bank branch downtown. If the parking requirements were changed, there could be a few spaces of street parking for bank customers only during business hours.
 - viii. Meg Arnold: I make a motion to recommend to council that the provision related to bank branches to re-configure the requirement.
 - ix. Motion passes.
 - b. Public Comments:
 - i. None.
- c. Reconsideration of DPAC recommendation on June 14, 2018 that the Car Wash / SPCA / Glass Shop area bounded by Third / H / Railroad be included in the specific plan area.
 - a. DPAC Comments:
 - ii. Meg Arnold: I make a motion that DPAC recommends that we do not include does not include that piece of property in the planning boundaries.
 - iii. Chris Granger: I want to open the discussion with Larry of East Davis. Clearly, you had a discussion with the neighbors about that land not being included and being treated the same way. An opportunity for it to be evaluated like east side of the railroad tracks being evaluated as it has already been. Did you discuss recent creating of opportunity zone with neighbors and are they aware of that?
 - iv. Larry Guenther: Yes, we have had that discussion and neighborhood association does not want downtown annexing parts of our neighborhood. Old East Davis did not contact the owners.
 - v. Josh Chapman: They are in full agreement that the property owners do not want to be part of it.

- vi. Michelle Byars: For the consultants, does it matter if that transition happens in the downtown plan or neighborhood plan?
- vii. Mitali Ganguly: It is not critical part. We would look to whatever direction from City or the committee, we did not have any anything specific for that.
- viii. Josh Chapman: When you talk about the scale of buildings, how do you scale the buildings to create this innovation district and the type of office and retail when behind it on G Street you have one-story buildings?
- ix. Mitali Ganguly: The transition will happen at all the edges in respects of contexts. We might need to adjust G Street district, but the transition will be gradual regardless of where the boundary is. The transitions will be happening at an appropriate scale within our realm of work and we would have done that gradual transition even if boundary was straight.
- x. Larry Guenther: To my understanding, the innovation district did not include the properties east of the railroad tracks.
- xi. Mitali Ganguly: Yes, we felt that the boundaries should be more in line with the existing character.
- b. Public Comments:
 - i. Community Member from Old East Davis: I support the conclusion to exclude the southside of 3rd Street from the plan.
- d. Request by Judy Corbett and Larry Guenther at June 14 meeting to discuss trees and sustainability.
 - a. DPAC Comments:
 - i. Larry Guenther: Trees weren't in the plan and we want them. It helps to cool the buildings. You need to be planting now.
 - ii. Mitali Ganguly: We did not make them a highlight of the workshop, but we recognize they need to be in the plan. They will be considered. Trees and shading are a part of our sustainability outlook.
 - b. Public Comments:
 - i. Ana McCann: We support trees in the plan.

11. Preparations for Check In Meetings with Planning Commission on August 22, 2018 and City Council on September 11, 2018

- a. Opticos presents how the key concepts developed at this stage of the planning process will be presented to the Planning Commission and City Council, and how feedback will be requested.
- b. DPAC Comments:
 - i. John Meyer: Will all the consultants be presenting the basic elements? And a comment by DPAC chair.
 - ii. Mitali Ganguly: The topics, yes.
 - iii. Meg Arnold: Certainly, but I am wondering about collecting that shared sentiment.

- iv. Meg Arnold: I would like to ask DPAC members to ID key messages you think is important for me to share at council. I might not name every one of them, but I will site overarching themes.
- v. Chris Granger: I wonder if we could ask council to give us direction on particular items. For example, top items they think we can do right away. The purpose of the check in is for the council to give direction to the consultants.
- vi. Meg Arnold: We have a responsibility to add to what the consultants are saying, whether it's the process, output so far, with a DPAC committee perspective. Please send 2-3 things you think it's important council hear, as well as direction you want from council to Bob.
- vii. Bob Wolcott: Please send those to me by Friday, August 17th.
- c. Public Comments:
 - i. None.

12. Other Committee, Staff or Consultant Communications

- a. Bob Wolcott: I will be retiring the end of September. It's been a pleasure working with you and I'm sure a suitable replacement will be assigned.
- b. Larry Guenther: Could we agenize an item that provides an opportunity for a wide range of ideas?
- c. John Meyer: Bend, Oregon feels like a working lab of this process. With historic neighborhoods and a downtown with 5 or 6-story buildings on the main street and felt like what Davis wants to be. It is a place that is our size.

13. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda

- a. Public Comments:
 - i. None.

14. Updated Schedule of Meetings and Adjournment

- a. The meeting is adjourned at 10:39 p.m.
- b. Check-in meetings with Planning Commission on August 22, 2018 and City Council on September 11, 2018 at Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard (not official DPAC meetings)
- c. September 20, 2018 DPAC meeting (receive comments by Planning Commission and City Council; next steps and schedule; description of upcoming outreach in October involving pop-ups, video and online questionnaire; and specific plan outline)
- d. October – November 2018: No DPAC meetings anticipated, consultant drafting specific plan
- e. December 2018 DPAC meeting (results of outreach in October, status of specific plan)