



## Meeting Minutes

### City of Davis

#### **Downtown Davis Plan Advisory Committee Meeting**

**At the Closing of the Participatory Design Workshop Event Being Held at**

**Davis Community Church Fellowship Hall, 412 C Street**

**Saturday, July 14, 2018**

**2:30 to 3:30 PM**

*With additions on August 9, 2018 shown in italics*

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

Liaison Members: Ryan Dodge, Cheryl Essex, Rob Hofmann

Absent: Josh Chapman, Catherine Brinkley, Eric Roe, Deema Tamimi, Matt Dulcich

City Staff: Bob Wolcott, Diane Parro

Consultants: Dan Parolek and Mitali Ganguly (Opticos Design), Isabelle Gaillard and Katie Durham (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 3:07 pm.
- b. Meg welcomed the DPAC members.
- c. All committee members present except Josh Chapman, Catherine Brinkley, Eric Roe, Deema Tamimi, Matt Dulcich.

#### **2. Approval of Agenda**

- a. The agenda is approved by consensus.

#### **3. Approval of Minutes**

- a. No meeting minutes were presented.

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

- a. No brief announcements.

**5. Consultant Presentation and Committee Discussion on the Participatory Design Workshop Process, Products and Next Steps**

a. DPAC Comments on Sustainability

- i. Larry Guenther: I think the idea of having a children's sustainability center is great.
  - ii. John Meyer: I like the idea to stay focused, pick a few items, and a team to own the process.
  - iii. Chris Granger: I like the idea to structure a matrix for the types of things we would like to do. It needs to be matched to existing goals of the city – for example our net zero carbon and our transportation goals. We also need to think about how we will measure them as they go forward.
  - iv. Michelle Byars: Is the underground storage feasible? Are there grants?
  - v. Rob White: Thank you to the team, this has been a great process. We want to make sure this balances in the equation. ULI has done a lot of work in this that shows cost benefit. The numbers need to pencil out.
  - vi. Darren McCaffrey: Doug, you said this was your last visit, does this also conclude your participation in this process?  
Dan Parolek: This is the last work Doug has been scoped to do. We would need to find more budget.
  - vii. Darren McCaffrey: Thank you to everyone for all the work you have done on the project.
  - viii. Chris Granger: We don't have a clear set of priorities – what are the next steps in the process around sustainability?
  - ix. Doug Farr: The list isn't complete. We need to get everyone's ideas on a list. Then we evaluate what is viable. I proposed a core leadership team to go line by line. Consultants shouldn't set priorities for you. We have great content, but who can get stuff done here? Does the City have staff to accomplish these tasks? Will PG&E partner with us? The highest priority is the core leadership team. In the 70s, there was a group that got together, and it had some good results. There's a quote "Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world; indeed, it's the only thing that ever has" Get a group together that is about 4-6 people. Change happens at the speed of trust.
  - x. Dan Parolek: I do feel like us strategizing about how to complete that list, and a discussion amongst the DPAC on an eco-district could be a possible initial step.
- b. Public Comment on Sustainability:
- i. Richard McCann: On the priority list, it's not so much the cost, but the timeline of each thing. Planting trees takes a short amount of time while building a bridge will take longer. Order of magnitude and expected cost. I felt like you listened to us. Thank you, Doug.
- c. DPAC Comments on Innovation District on G Street:

- i. Darren McCaffrey: Perhaps we could get local property owners whose store fronts are vacant to allow the business incubation idea that Doug was talking about. For the innovation district, perhaps we could anchor that space with something from the university. We need to draw the university into downtown so people can see it, and so that community members can interact with it and participate in the research.
  - ii. John Meyer: What exactly does an innovation district mean? Is it Innovation on G Street only? Is there flexibility in the name? Hopefully the whole region can be an innovation district.
  - iii. Dan Parolek: While looking at small scale infill opportunities, it hit me. This is the best opportunity in the entire downtown for bigger footprint business. It can send a message to either the university, or some other big company that “we are open for business.” It could start with adaptive re-use. If you need a building with a footprint of 25,000 sq. feet, this is the place you can do it.
  - iv. Rob White: It’s not impossible for us to engage with the university, but we need to engage that property owner that owns 30% of the land.
  - v. Larry Guenther: Transition is crucial to the neighborhood.
  - vi. Randy Yackzan: Dan, I was pleased that you put in the innovation center – I think you suggested a team from the City to work with the university. They have big plans and they are close to the downtown. UC Berkley and the city have fought for years, and now they are working together and the City is helping build things for the university. The location, land owners, the relationship between the university are important.
  - vii. Michelle Byars: I love the idea of getting rid of the parking lots. I would like us to bring in the agriculture and beer brewing. We could tap some areas within UC Davis.
  - viii. Meg Arnold: We could discuss this more at the August 9 meeting.
  - ix. Cheryl Essex: *Too many overlays are on of the challenges for the planning commission now. Would it over-complicate planning efforts? What types of development would you not allow that would be allowed in the rest of downtown?*
- d. General DPAC Comments on any topic:
- i. Larry Guenther: Matt Kowta, are you using a different metric for building with height difference?
  - ii. Matt Kowta: Unless we get into a different construction type we are not at a detail level where we make changes in per square foot cost, but if we pushed up above 5 built stories we would need to look at reinforced concrete or steel.
  - iii. Larry Guenther: What about in terms of units versus square footage on return? City Council has looked at moving away from unit-based cost structure of permitting. If that paradigm changes, will the information change?
  - iv. Matt Kowta: Not necessarily, when we are dealing with a permit/cost structure its on a per unit basis and that’s going to discourage smaller units. So that’s an issue we need to look into. It will come down to sale-

able and rentable square feet and how much of that can be in a given parcel without triggering higher square foot construction cost. It is possible, it's just a matter of what we want to model.

- v. Dan Parolek: It's more, what assumptions are we making – impact fees.
- vi. Larry Guenther: We can use it as a tool to decide what our fees should look like.
- vii. Matt Kowta: We need to be sure not to make disincentives.
- viii. Darren McCaffrey: I came in late to a meeting in the corner about universal design. There is no one on the DPAC who is disabled or meets with groups who live with those challenges, so I would just ask that we have good communication with all people who have concerns with accessibility. That goes to transportation, to street design, and to new units that are built downtown.
- ix. Cheryl Essex: I'm wondering whether the consultant is feeling like these concepts are the way we are moving forward. *The DPAC is seeing some of these illustrations for the first time today.*
- x. Dan Parolek: I wouldn't call it final, but we are feeling pretty good compared to the first workshop. We might need to make minor tweaks, but we are feeling good about a lot of these different elements. Unless we hear something different from the DPAC, we are not planning to make major changes. Also – how is the DPAC thinking about interacting with the accessibility community?
- xi. Darren McCaffrey: We may be better served by a more formal communication vehicle.
- xii. John Meyer: For clarification regarding the SPCA site – from what I understand, it was recommended that we remove it, but we are keeping it in. I would suggest we formally take it up.
- xiii. Larry Guenther: Regarding bike lanes, E street businesses only have the street for deliveries. Maybe the image where you have alternating paths with chicane should take that into effect.
- xiv. Greg Behrens: There is flexibility in design. We like it on E street because of the double-parking issue we have today.
- xv. Chris Granger: It seems as though there is a structural issue for DPAC working on accessible issues. Maybe we need a liaison structure. We have city staff that could contribute to that.
- xvi. Meg Arnold: Specifically on engaging with disabled community - we could perhaps have a conversation at the next August 9 meeting. Meg moves to bring this topic to August 9 meeting. All in favor. Motion passes.
- xvii. Meg Arnold: Let's talk about the SPCA site issue.
- xviii. Cheryl Essex: *I made the initial suggestion to consider adding SPCA site. Eric Roe made a good argument for it. We voted to add it. I think we should wait to vote again until the August meeting.*
- xix. Rob White: Can we discuss the reasons for in/out on the SPCA?
- xx. Cheryl Essex: I have concerns about street design concepts. The DPAC needs sufficient time to review that.
- xxi. Sinisia Novakovic: We are on the cusp of building cheaper and cheaper roofs. Roofs generating electricity are phenomenal. The reason to not have

- zero net energy doesn't exist. We need empowering dreams to get the momentum going for our dream about no gas.
- xxii. Ryan Dodge: The BTSSC Commissioners would be interested in the street design commissions – can they see this and weigh-in before it is final?
  - xxiii. Darren McCaffrey: Any group that wants to give input should be giving it everyday. This is it and it is happening. Let's get it out there.
  - xxiv. Michelle Byars: There are other commissions that would have the same thoughts.
  - xxv. Chris Granger: If it is packaged for all of our commissions, that would be helpful.
  - xxvi. John Meyer: If we do a council briefing and commissioners are there saying they have never seen it, it might look bad to the Councilmembers. This could be an opportunity to explain the process.
  - xxvii. Dan Parolek: The commissioners have been invited to join in on the process.
  - xxviii. John Meyer: We need a structure that doesn't put the council in a tough spot, making decisions about the plan when commissioners haven't seen it.
  - xxix. Randy Yackzan: The consultants have a scope and their budgets are tight – we are now asking that they go to all the commissions... I'm disagreeing a little because there will always be someone who missed it. Does Dan put together a package that the liaisons present to their respective groups?
  - xxx. John Meyer: As we heard earlier, progress is based on trust.
  - xxxi. Rob White: This is a discussion for staff and the City manager.
  - xxxii. Justin Goss: On my finance and budget commission, we talked about and have often agendized the Downtown Plan. And I have previously brought back info from them.
  - xxxiii. Chris Granger: I would add to that, it's about buy-in. Education of the community and the City staff is important.
  - xxxiv. Meg Arnold: I will ask that staff figure this out and report back to us.
  - xxxv. Ryan Dodge: I'm not asking for a presentation. I have missed some meetings, but this is starting to sound firm. I need the resources to present to the BTSSC Commission.
  - xxxvi. Meg Arnold: All in favor to have city staff report back. Motion passes.

## 6. Public Comments on Items Not on Agenda

### a. Public Comment

- i. Rhonda Reed: I'm glad to hear the consultants discuss delivery trucks. I like the idea of the solar walk-ways. I was happy with the general districts in the planning concepts until the innovation districts were limited to G Street. I like the prospect of bringing more diversity to potential jobs.
- ii. Bonnie Mintun: I was on the focus group about inclusion. I would like to give a short presentation at the August 9 meeting. We hear a lot of positive talk about pioneering efforts – Davis was the first to include kids with disabilities in our schools. The City of Davis was the first to have inclusive recreation. People with disabilities are often an afterthought. We don't just want to talk about accessibility, but to be part of the town.

- iii. Lena Contreras: Someone mentioned that people should be commenting daily. Because I am vision impaired, I cannot see the pictures and can't comment on everything. I suggest you talk to a cane specialist – they teach people how to use a cane and a guide dog. They would have good commentary on how a street would work for me. The society of blind is in Sacramento. There are teachers of visually impaired. I suggest you consult with the experts in the blindness field.
- iv. Bonnie Mintun: I just to add on to that. If you do it right first, it doesn't cost more. We want to be involved now.
- v. Cathy Forkas: Thinking about the parking management versus a parking problem, but on the streetscapes, a lot of parking is disappearing. You need to be honest about that because we already perceive parking is a problem.
- vi. Lorenzo Kristof: Hello, I am a member of the Utility Rates Advisory Commission and I was in the Sustainability Focus Group. I am concerned there are many development projects that will come through while we are waiting for the plan to be implemented that will be building with electric in mind and building the right infrastructure.
- vii. Councilmember Dan Carson: In Brett Lee and Lucas Frerichs did a good job explaining how to plan to look at this plan at the May 31 DPAC meeting. My job is to support the exchange of ideas.

**7. Other Committee and Staff Communications**

- a. No additional committee or staff communications.

**8. Next DPAC Meeting Date and Adjournment**

- a. The meeting adjourned at 4:09 pm.
- b. The next DPAC meeting is scheduled for August 9, 2018 at 7 PM at the Senior Center Activity Room, 646 A Street with agenda items including: summary report on the July Participatory Design Workshop; and preparations for check-in meetings with Planning Commission meeting on August 22, 2018 and City Council on September 11, 2018.