



Meeting Minutes

City of Davis

Downtown Davis Plan Advisory Committee Meeting

Senior Center Activity Room, 646 A Street

Thursday, September 20, 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, Eric Roe, Deema Tamimi, Randy Yackzan

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

Not present: Sinisa Novakovic, Rob White

City Council Liaisons: Brett Lee, Dan Carson

City Staff: Bob Wolcott, Diane Parro, Heidi Tschudin, Eric Lee

Consultants: Dan Parolek, Mitali Ganguly and Caroline Swinehart (Opticos Design), Isabelle Gaillard and Taylor Coover (AIM)

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 Sinisa Novakovic and Rob White.

2. Approval of Agenda

- a. The agenda is approved by consensus.
- b. Meg Arnold: I propose to reverse number seven and number eight on the agenda tonight bringing the discussion of sustainability first.
- c. All in favor. Motion passes.

3. Approval of Minutes

- a. Approval on minutes from July 14 and August 9.
- b. Meg Arnold: I noticed additions to Item 5C-9 and 5D-9.

- c. Meg Arnold: I would like to make a motion to approve July 14 meeting minutes.
 - d. All in favor. Motion passes.
 - e. Meg Arnold: I make a motion to approve the August 9 meeting minutes.
 - f. All in favor. Motion passes.
- 4. Brief Announcements from Chair, Committee Members, Staff or Consultants**
- a. Meg Arnold: The Downtown plan is crucial to our home here together. I want to thank Bob Wolcott and applaud the work he has done. Thank you for your expertise behind the scenes and your attention to detail and deadlines. I appreciate your support and guidance with the DPAC. The City was lucky to have your talents and I wish you the best in retirement.
 - b. Bob: I would like to introduce Eric Lee, who will be taking over my role. He has been with the City since 2006 after studying environmental science at UC Santa Cruz. One thought is please know that we are only halfway through the process. There is still lots of room for ideas.
 - c. Meg: There was a lot of good discussion in the Planning Commission and City Council meeting last month. However, a good number of remarks at the Planning Commission meeting were a surprise to me, as they had not come up in our DPAC meetings before. There was a lot of merit and substance to the comments and I want to make sure we address them. All of us on the DPAC committee work together to create an environment that respects all contributions and making sure we understand the seriousness of the project on behalf of the city. If you have concerns or questions with how we as a committee are doing things, please share them with the DPAC or share them with me one on one.
- 5. Comments at Check-in Meetings with Planning Commission on August 22, 2018 and City Council on September 11, 2018 (7:15 – 7:40 PM)**
- a. DPAC Comments:
 - b. Meg Arnold: I would like to share my ideas first, go on to Michelle and then open up the discussion to all of you. After hearing the comments at both meetings and DPAC meetings, I heard three issues come up. The first is the issue of economics in the context of a future strategy for City and downtown. This also includes feasibility, in terms of what the Specific Plan envisions, if it can actually be built and if it will make sense. In addition to that, the context of affordability in housing has come up many times as well. The second issue is the implementation strategy, in terms of what it is and what the City is doing to undertake the Specific Plan. The third issue is sustainability which we will talk more about that later as it was certainly brought up at the City Council meeting.
 - c. Michelle Byars: I would say that I heard comments about parking, including both sides of community members that wanted parking and community members that did not want parking. Affordable housing was a concern of many community members and the implementation of affordable housing and if the DPAC would be involved in the process as well as how form-based code covers affordability. Generally, the overall concern is the implementation of the Specific Plan and people want to see sustainability as a stand out element and they are not satisfied by what they've seen so far. City Council wants to do a more thorough analysis.

- d. Rob Hoffman: At the Planning Commission meeting, a large majority has concerns with economics, both in implementation and the Planning Commission perspective. We are focusing on downtown Davis and defining what the vision is for our downtown and what it will be. It needs to still be a retail hub and we need to flush out and utilize the data if we are looking to throwing all of our eggs in the basket of innovation or elsewhere. A majority of commissioners touched on sustainability as well.
- e. Cheryl Essex: Affordable housing is important, some concerns of the commission included that there wasn't enough affordable housing in the Specific Plan thus far behind all the pretty pictures that were presented. It is a challenge for a volunteer organization like the Planning Commission to keep close eye and understand the data analysis on existing conditions and also understand what is underlined in the presentation given to the Planning Commission. The commission deals with projects that work to fit into what the current plans are. The commission's goal is to produce new guidelines that are clear and can be implemented and making sure that is possible. The city has lots of assets downtown in parking and properties, and a critical component is affordability and feasibility. How will the City use the assets to meet goals of economic development? They need to be willing to partner with someone to build a bigger mixed-use project for some of these goals. Frankly, I was impressed with information from the meeting and I believe we are moving forward in a good way and we are on track.
- f. Rob Hoffman: Some commission members are concerned and want to make sure that what is being develop is sufficient to the uniqueness of Davis. Some of the information presented was for other communities that doesn't really apply to Davis. What challenges that may exist in Davis may not exist elsewhere. We need to ensure those things fit into this type of plan and if it addresses this issue or not.
- g. John Meyer: I believe that the Planning Commission is caught in the fact that there isn't a concrete narrative plan in how you move forward because we are still in the planning process. I would suggest taking pause if the comments were for form-based code because we aren't at that stage yet and we will address it when it gets here. The recent City Council meeting was designed as a check-in and it seemed as if the downtown plan is serving as a proxy for issues that are much bigger than the Specific Plan. Sustainability includes the entire community and beyond. For example, if they are asking for storm drain, it should be community based. Downtown needs to be a leader but we can't ask the plan to do all the heavy lifting. The concerns with affordable housing are legit, but there are grander issues to push forward in general plan, but this has become a proxy problem.
- h. Larry Guenther: There are a few issues I've thought about during this process. One is that this is supposed to be a downtown plan update, but the entire zoning paradigm is different. That is a lot of work for what was originally intended of the committee. There are still people telling me that we need better restaurants downtown. The City has control over the zoning, parking, city property and programming for events. The City does not have control over where and when redevelopment happens. Private property owners either redevelop or they don't. We have had that discussion about financials ~~and people~~ and people say we cannot build in downtown, but people have. Eric has built a building downtown.

There is also the new building on the 200 block of C Street. Buildings are being built and if the financials don't work because the cost of a lot is too high, then why aren't market forces driving the costs? I think that the Specific Plan can be carried out because it is currently being carried out. The buildings that are being built in Davis current fit what we are talking about.

- i. Meg Arnold: What I am hearing is that the question is about economic feasibility.
- j. Randy Yackazan: I want to touch on Meg's comments, as I was not at the Planning Commission meeting. I apologize that you were personally attacked and you had to deal with it. One issue I see is economics as it seems impossible at times. If we go back to when John was City Manager, we ran a forum on what makes sense in downtown, which currently had mostly single-story flat roof buildings, retail, restaurants and surface parking, but City Council said no. We also had a redevelopment agency work with council. Instead, they brought in movie theaters and a five-story parking structure and a large office building and bring in 300 workers to downtown. We had a goal with the federal government, redevelopment agency, City Manager and City Council, and a brilliant development team to make it happen. To start off, if a nice Martian were to visit downtown, he would see our plans and walk around downtown and observe the one-story flat roof buildings and then go another block to the University and come to the conclusion that this is what they want, including parking structures, five and eight story buildings and retail. This is what we want and the economics are different next door. This is one thing I've pushed is for us to try and find the things that the University needs as they are a powerful economic engine and that is really important. Once we are done here, I recommend we work with the University after this plan and make sure to start with what we want and how do we get there. We have a plan showing our ideas, do and don'ts to do great work and see what happens.
- k. Darren McCaffrey: A lot of the feasibility and implementation will happen slowly at first and then increase in speed as people go along and figure out that you actually can buy a property, take your plan in and go through the process that will take 3-6 months instead of 5 years. The current culture of development downtown deters people from developing. The city has done everything to resist redevelopment unless you have the money to do it. So to say the plan is hopeless is silly because we haven't started writing it yet.
- l. Justin Goss: Between the Planning Commission meeting and City Council meeting, the words finances and feasibility is being thrown around a lot. To this the Finance and Budget Commission thinks that now would be the time to offer services to DPAC to advise the committee as much as possible. We are ready to review the cost benefit analysis of the plan, produce calculations of office retail and mixed use. We will also look at the feasibility study while working with public private partnerships and seeing how that would work. This also includes looking at the plan proposal encourage development, which was brought up at City Council when DPAC said it in April, as well as recommendations to cut. Needless to say, the Finance and Budget Commission is willing to offer services to DPAC and we are able to go out and get information from the consultants.
- m. John Meyer: I am concerned about the projects and the biggest gift the Specific Plan can give is certainty. If you can give neighborhoods and property owners a

certain process that includes the core strategy of plan drawn up, that is the huge sweet spot.

- n. Judy Corbett: I agree. I know great affordable housing developer that would not enter the current downtown development.
- o. Matt Dulcich: The University perspective is included in the overall GPU update and we are working on how to get it to the vision, as it is not UC Davis plan, but it is local effort.
- p. Demma Temimi: I thought this is the opportunity for economic development and we avoided doing it because we aren't using economic development to solve all these things. The expectation is that the Specific Plan will figure out economic development and have it be part of the future of Davis and it will be helpful to figure out what the DPAC can and should be doing. We need to be given a concrete outline of what our plan will do and this is our limit.
- q. Larry Guenther: The building of three stories on C street was a Planning Commission project because it fit in the zoning. The problem was that we want to go in different directions with the planning.
- r. Chris Granger: Justin's offer is tied to sustainability discussion and we are looking for a clear delimitation with what analytics we need to get done for the downtown plan, including what will make it a great plan and what the next phase will consist of. This includes what belongs in the sustainability plan and how we clearly understand that. We need to inform the consultants of what is essential to the plan, what needs to get done and figure out how to do it. Either the Commission does it or an outside group does an analysis.
- s. Catherine Brinkley: I was surprised about the Planning Commission comments as well. I think they feel as if we haven't been informing them enough. I think the way to prevent this type of situation for occurring again is to have more regular check-ins with the Planning Commission.
- t. Meg Arnold: We had previously talked about wanting to set up circumstances to give the city's commissions the opportunity to meet with the DPAC. The ideas to meet with the different groups had promise.
- u. Heidi Tschudin: In the next couple of months, we will circulate the first draft of the plan to the public. All the ideas will come together in the next couple of months and also may have one or two workshops with full staff to have a presentation of the Specific Plan thus far. This will provide a chance for all advisory committees to come to a workshop and possibly conduct meetings at same time. This provides an opportunity to ask questions. However, we aren't fully there yet, but it is an efficient way to allow for feedback.
- v. Meg Arnold: I would like to touch again on Justin's offer from the finance and budget commission and convey my appreciation for the offer, but apologize for not making it a formal agenda item. Please email the information to the DPAC and I will attend the next meeting. Tonight might not be official yes or no to Justin's offer, but we would like to take whole set of ideas and figure out recommendations.
- w. Darren McCaffrey: Does anyone have a reason why Justin's offer would be a bad idea?
- x. John Meyer: Is the committee staffed? Opposed to volunteers.
- y. Justin Goss: Yes, the commission is staffed.

- z. Meg Arnold: Great idea. We should use tonight to gather ideas and ask staff to think through ideas and come back with recommendations. No motion.
- aa. Public Comments:
- bb. Matt Williams: We want to be clear on that this is your process and we would be here to help you and that may mean working with consultants. We are a resource that will help.

6. Description of Outreach in September (7:40 – 7:55 PM)

- a. The consultants will describe the outreach including pop-up workshops, an informational video, and an on-line questionnaire.
- b. DPAC Comments:
- c. John Meyer: The game pop-up on Friday, September 28 is the first Friday that the students are back at the University and could be crazy.
- d. Darren McCaffrey: The map that we are currently showing does not have Depot inside the boundary of the project even though it is. We should update the map that is online.
- e. Meg Arnold: Thank you Isabelle, and DPAC should help promote the pop-up workshops.
- f. Public Comments:
- g. None.

8Draft Approach for Specific Plan and Form Based Code (7:55 – 8:25 PM)

- h. The consultants will summarize the draft approach document for the Specific Plan and Form Based Code.
- i. DPAC Comments:
 - i. John Meyer: Will the Specific Plan and draft code come out concurrent?
 - ii. Mitali Ganguly: Yes, it might be staggered, but it's our plan.
 - iii. Meg Arnold: I am seeing a fair bit of pink and green. Particularly, Chapter 3 is where the vision seems the most dense, the discussion of sustainability related topics. Don't forget about the trees, item has been added. In Chapter 5.5 was useful because it speaks to recommended additional tasks after the Specific Plan is adopted and enforced.
 - iv. Bob Wolcott: To staff and consultants, a key issue is what needs to be done now in the plan and what can be put into an action item and additional tasks, but we need to know what can be done additionally in terms of sustainability, economics and help us know what we are missing. Also, there could be a group that could propose what things are wanted and needed and create a list. Staff and consultants can review it and come back to the DPAC with recommendations. There are things that can be done now, such as Justin's offer to look at feasibility.
 - v. Meg Arnold: So that is a challenge that you would like us to respond to.
 - vi. Chris Granger: With greenhouse gas emissions, it is the look of energy, the question of "where are we now in terms of energy and buildings, and what can we do in the future?" The state of California gave us goals – do we want to beat it or live within it? Energy and greenhouse gases are not listed.
 - vii. Meg Arnold: Exactly, so what are the things that need to be in this plan?

- viii. Catherine Brinkley: In terms of energy, there is a lot that can go into that. It could be percent renewable depending on space or existing grid infrastructure, including natural gas.
- ix. John Meyer: What is required for the CEQA document? If we are going to do the analysis, we should get out in front of it.
- x. Darren McCaffrey: For the recommended additional tasks, is that the place where you recommend Council or the committee to look into programming and how that can support the plan? Specifically activating the spaces in the E Street Plaza. There was a comment at City Council about the farmers market structure. Would that be something to include in this plan?
- xi. Dan Parolek: Some of those would be included in the plan as basic recommendations, but we would typically find what is missing and recommend that in the Specific Plan, whether it be a new entity or utilizing one that already exists.
- xii. Randy Yackazan: The gentleman that talked about natural gas and working with multiple cities, that is huge. Do we actually want to build anything? First, we have to figure out what we want to build and all the components and sustainability. Someone is doing this somewhere in California. Is feasibility really part of this?
- xiii. Meg Arnold: My understanding is that is part of the implementation process.
- xiv. Dan Parolek: We will put a price tag on an item, and name potential funding sources and then prioritize based on whether it is a 5-year, 10 year or 15-year plan. Those things will happen.
- xv. Chris Granger: I would like to remind everyone that the state code is moving, so some of this will be required in a few years. It's not going to be a choice, it is what we need to plan for.
- xvi. Catherine Brinkley: I don't think we should just think about sustainability as a regulatory hurdle to jump over or cost a lot, but it could also save us money. I spent today with SMUD to work to provide energy at a lower cost. There is potential here if we can find a way to provide energy at a lower cost. We need to think through what kind of grid we want to have.
- xvii. Meg Arnold: What do we want to make sure is in the table of contents that is not currently listed?
- xviii. Chris Granger: There has been a lot of discussion of microgrids and I am assuming that has been addressed in our process somehow and how it would fit under the energy discussion in the plan. I don't see much about affordability in here. Where is the housing? Or downtown as a neighborhood discussion? I think it has been lost in the structure.
- xix. Cheryl Essex: One is making sure as we implement parking changes about parking downtown and put adequate safeguards in adjacent neighborhoods so they are not overwhelmed by cars parking in the neighborhood.
- xx. Mitali Ganguly: The parking strategy is included in 4.2. We are just listing the topics and subtopics, but the actual content is the same.
- xxi. Cheryl Essex: Are you are looking beyond the downtown to the adjacent neighborhoods?

- xxii. Mitali Ganguly: Yes. I do not have the strategies right now since it is with the parking consultant. An idea is to get a neighborhood parking permit so you don't have to move your car. We will prioritize neighborhood parking. There will be more detailed strategies in the Specific Plan.
- xxiii. Cheryl Essex: In the historic resources management, there was discussions going on with the downtown area to see if there were historic structures or potential structures that could be registered. This just says recommendations to historic resources management and a way to engage that commission to make sure we have the decisions made building by building. We want the commission to feel like they are included and the ones that are not eligible are clearly laid out. I would love to see more information in 5.4 and would require the commission to be engaged.
- xxiv. Dan: There will be that level of information included, it is that part of it is still coming. For example, in the first workshop, our consultant mentioned that he considered getting rid of that level which will be controversial so we have to frame that recommendation and have that discussion as we move forward.
- xxv. Cheryl Essex: I think it is really important to wrap that into the historical resources management commission so they provide information specifically on that piece.
- xxvi. Catherine Brinkley: We talked a lot about universal design, but I don't think I saw that in here and there are a couple places we could put it in the vision. We can talk about it in streets.
- xxvii. Mitali Ganguly: We put it into the vision on page 8. For some of the items of universal design and sustainability which are the themes throughout the document. We were thinking of using graphics or symbols throughout the document instead of it only being in one place in order to create a theme.
- xxviii. Judy Corbett: A few times at the Council meeting, we talked about taking advantage of being in a rural agricultural area and the University and farmers market. I am not sure where we put that.
- xxix. Meg Arnold: I think that specific topic fits into the broader question of economic development.
- xxx. Dan Parolek: That is a much bigger conversation than economic development. It will start at the vision chapter and works its way into other chapters, including implementation.
- xxxi. Chris Granger: There has been discussion around the protection or strategies related to existing businesses, small and local businesses. I'm not sure where that belongs or if it is a vision thing.
- xxxii. Bob Wolcott: Since the committee members felt strongly enough to mention the things they are doing right now, we should try our best to get these into the outline. We won't be creating perfect consistency we should try our best to get these into the outline. It won't be perfect consistency in general vs specificity. My suggestion is that it needs to say "examples under this section are A, B and C." in italics. They felt strong enough to say it and just saying it will be included in the vision isn't enough. We should note these things.

- xxxiii. Heidi Tschudin: I'm not sure all of the items we are hearing need to be a table of contents. Some will be policy items, some will be regulatory requirements, some will come later with the implementation. This is just a tool to get this list and I would say keep the information coming with the list and we will capture the list and continue to work with the consultants to ensure they will be included in the first draft. The test will be the first draft and we can look and find these things. We can move them or add where needed.
- xxxiv. Dan Parolek: Back to Judy's question of reinforcing unique aspects of Davis and it is a continued theme for us and reflected in current online survey about specific elements that will create an identity for Davis. The public draft is still a working document and there is an opportunity for comment after the draft comes out.
- xxxv. Heidi: If anyone has ideas between now and next Friday, send it to Eric Lee.
- xxxvi. Meg Arnold: Are there other things that need to be in the plan?
- xxxvii. Chris Granger: Our transportation representatives are not here tonight so we want to make sure we get their feedback as well.

j. Public Comments:

- i. There's a great start for sustainability implementation plan in the Nishi implementation plan that was created with consultants and city. It's something for a new development project because there is nothing on that site. It addresses many of these topics and it's a great start. If the plan can identify opportunities that are local energy providers, we can look to it in the future and it would be helpful to shape the plan over the next few years. It would help people understand the plan now and what is next.

7Request for Discussion of Sustainability (8:25 – 8:40 PM)

- k. On August 9, 2018, Catherine Brinkley and Chris Granger requested an item to discuss "sustainability" in the Downtown Plan. Issues of interest include: how the three "legs" of sustainability will be addressed in the specific plan; and whether specific additional work scope should be suggested for the Downtown Plan. The draft approach / table of contents documents in the previous agenda item may be considered in this discussion. Public comments (may be limited to 1-2 minutes per speaker).
- l. DPAC Comments:
- m. Chris Granger: As part of discussion at the workshop was that several members of the focus group said that if you need us, we would like to provide some expertise for a clear framework for downtown. At the same time, consultants asked a few of us about that and what next? What is best way forward? They made it clear that there was no funding currently for any additional analytical work on sustainability. Catherine and I raised questions about how to move forward with what hasn't been done. We also felt as we presented at council that this isn't only area, there is economic analysis and how we include affordability and equity into the downtown as well. Our question is what are the essential things that have to be done? How do we get it done in time for the draft? We can't wait until our next

meeting to get that done, unless we push back the timeline of when the actual plan will be done. We basically asked council for direction and that is why it is on the agenda now because they said figure it out and tell them if they need more money and if they need a group to help with the work and what they can do to help. I would like to hear from the consultant team about what is essential and your recommendation.

- n. Dan Parolek: This is not my area of expertise, but we have barely scratched the surface on the subtopics of sustainability. We took a first pass at establishing a matrix with the topics and put actions underneath. There is still work to be done.
- o. Chris Granger: I want to discuss GHG emissions. We are required in the CEQA document to run analytics in regards to GHG emissions. The government just set a goal that is more ambitious than our current goal. Is what we are proposing going to produce that? We should do it now.
- p. Catherine: Do you run the plan through CEQA?
- q. Dan Parolek: It would not be ideal, but what is typically done is that you test and check its performance. Taking a step back, we would like direction on what you think should happen in the Specific Plan and what could happen after implementation. We probably all agree we cannot tackle everything and we need to prioritize.
- r. John Meyer: Doug Farr's advice was to choose three to give things. The entire General Plan needs to embrace that. If we do analytics, they should serve the whole city.
- s. Chris Granger: This could be a model for the next plan.
- t. Catherine Brinkley: The problem is that you run into economic constraints. We need to think about how we harness the expertise we currently have.
- u. John Meyer: I think that the focus group for affordability needs to be a mix of developers and property owners, among others.
- v. Dan Parolek: We talked about with the staff today about Matt's feasibility in economics. We need to be careful because it is already tight. Doug Farr also recommended to sign up to be an eco-district. I'm not an expert but it could put Downtown Davis on the national setting immediately. It could also give an opportunity for member representatives of the community to attend a kick-off. It could help a small group of dedicated community members.
- w. John Meyer: Reframe the question to "how can this be possible?"
- x. Meg Arnold: What is an eco-district?
- y. Chris Granger: Most are not retrofitting. They are new in mostly torn down places. I'm not sure if it's a solution in downtown.
- z. Dan Parolek: I just wanted to replant the seed. There needs to be some product delivered in the next couple months.
- aa. Heidi: Don't lose sight of the fact that this downtown Specific Plan is a key component of sustainability. Sometimes with these plans, evolution isn't a bad thing. Don't get in the way of your own success. You get more than one bite of the apple.
- bb. Matt Dulcich: Making this effort CEQA savvy will be in the best interest of moving forward.
- cc. Chris Granger: I would like to add that members of the natural resources commission were at the presentations and their meeting is next week. They

- haven't responded yet, but they are planning to have a discussion and submit comments.
- dd. Catherine Brinkley: Is it too early to ask if we are going to have a citizen committee or hire expert consultant services?
 - ee. Meg Arnold: I think what we are doing tonight is making a list of certain things to move forward in a more productive way. One of which being what Council asked if we need to spend more money, whether if that is bringing back Doug Farr for more or hiring a different type of consulting firm that could help us advance the topic. Item two could be asking that the committee to support us in the same way that finance and budget has offered. Item three is to convene a subset of ourselves or a couple of us from the focus group from the second workshop. Is there another solution we've been talking about that I didn't capture?
 - ff. Bob Wolcott: The next item is the layout of the table of contents.
 - gg. Meg Arnold: Are we meeting again? We need something before.
 - hh. Dan Parolek: I would suggest that our team and staff schedule a call with Chris or a small group within the DPAC to get recommendation on defining priorities and next steps. You would need to bring it back to others.
 - ii. Chris Granger: Maybe, it depends on what the big content pieces are. I don't feel comfortable being the sole person.
 - jj. Meg Arnold: Maybe it's a sole subset.
 - kk. Justin Goss: At the intersection of finance and budget commission's offer and sustainability discussion is that we have been taken in by the feasibility analysis that has been presented to us, but it is based on existing conditions and we are creating a long-term document. Existing conditions are going to change while this plan is still in effect.
 - ll. Darren McCaffrey: My takeaway and Doug's recommendation was to find three people in the focus group with one being in the DPAC. Task them with this. Let them have at it and come back to the City. The problem with overlaying too many things is that we bog everything down once it is all written.
 - mm. Meg Arnold: It sounds like we need to make another meeting in October.
 - nn. Mitali Ganguly: December is too late – we would need to go back and re-write.
 - oo. Catherine Brinkley: A dedicated citizen group could tackle it.
 - pp. Chris Granger: Transportation changes can make a huge change on GHG emissions and analysis.
 - qq. Larry Guenther: Do we need a subcommittee?
 - rr. Meg Arnold: We are surfacing a lot of ways to tackle significant topics. Let's use tonight to talk about them, and not commit to them yet. Staff can work to find best solution and bring them back to us in October.
 - ss. Catherine Brinkley: that might give one less month of time for them to help us.
 - tt. Eric Roe: What I heard loud and clear is implementation is needed and how to incentivize property owners. There are a lot of fees. I paid for city staff hours. Yes, downtown rent would be high with housing, but affordability is hard to sell. Vertical mixed-use construction is more expensive than affordable housing and it works better with a larger scale project. Affordable housing in downtown will be difficult to achieve in my opinion. I appreciate sustainability, but I worry about the cost.

- uu. Cheryl Essex: Thank you Eric for looking at feasibility. How do we leverage city assets that allow you to do that and how does the city take some burden off the parking?
 - vv. Public Comments:
 - i. Mike Hart: Everyone's doing green buildings, ride share, which produces a big GHG reduction in sewer/waste, garbage, natural gas. These three things together are a solution. A lot of cities are looking at this now.
- 7. Request by Mr. Mike Hart To Present Transportation Initiatives (8:40 – 8:50 PM)**
- a. On August 9, 2018, Mr. Hart requested an item to share three initiatives consisting of a trolley concept, an overcrossing concept, and the elimination of freight rail through Davis from Woodland.
 - b. DPAC Comments:
 - c. Eric Roe: What is your estimate on rail system?
 - d. Mike Hart: I do not have one. I am dodging the question because the technology has changed since 2010.
 - e. Eric Roe: For example, the track would go down 1st street? Would it share the lane with the cars?
 - f. Mike Hart: It would be on one side and it would be separated. It would probably be on the south side.
 - g. Larry Guenther: Why the tracks? That is a huge infrastructure project. It seems like autonomous vehicles is what's coming. It is tough to put track in and change them. Will it eliminate stops and travel slow enough to jump on and off?
 - h. Mike Hart: Reason is a fixed guideway, which means you're on steel wheels. You reduce your friction tremendously and it is an easier way of moving a vehicle. Easier way of moving vehicle. I would use concrete ties, which means you can landscape the whole corridor. There are many safety regulations to jump on and off.
 - i. Public Comments:
 - j. None.
- 8. Working List of Action Items That Might be Recommended to City Council for Early "Wins." (8:50 – 9:00 PM)**
- a. A draft list of this type was requested for consideration by DPAC members on August 9, 2018.
 - b. DPAC Comments:
 - c. Meg Arnold: We made a formal recommendation in august, regarding zoning regulations around banks. Second is dated today,
 - d. Bob Wolcott: We heard interest in this item and suggest that council consider amending this item to encourage smaller ownership and not discourage it. We heard it, but didn't know if you wanted it on the working list.
 - e. Meg Arnold: Is this a topic we want to recommend to City Council? If it is, will someone make a motion on this recommendation?
 - f. All in favor. Motion passes.
 - g. Larry Guenther: The conditional use permit for anything greater than two story building be removed. This was brought up at the Planning Commission and City Council meeting.

- h. Bob Wolcott: The existing zoning as described is probably going to be changed. The plan is developing these items.
 - i. Meg Arnold: If we were to take action on this specific thing tonight, it would be moved essentially?
 - j. Bob Wolcott: Yes, I think so. It will all be dealt with through this draft plan.
 - k. John Meyer: The fee structure is separate from zoning.
 - l. Meg Arnold: The council has already decided to take this issue up.
 - m. Public Comments:
 - n. None.
- 9. Working Schedule (9:00 – 9:10 PM)**
- a. A working schedule is provided in the agenda packet.
 - b. DPAC Comments:
 - c. Bob Wolcott: The schedule is ongoing as needed and will add as needed.
 - d. Meg: Guess that there will be an October meeting.
 - e. Public Comments: None.
- 10. Other Committee, Staff or Consultant Communications (9:10 – 9:15 PM)**
- a. Promote opportunities!
 - b. Cheryl: Applications for planning commission are available.
 - c. Meg: Cheryl and Rob terms are up.
 - d. Meg: Received two informational items by email. One about Portland sent by Judy with housing issues. Went to council from September 12 with the issue of affordable housing.
 - e. John: Very interesting and complex.
- 11. Public Comments on Items Not on the Agenda (9:15 – 9:25 PM)**
- a. Public Comments:
 - b. None.
- 12. Updated Schedule of Meetings and Adjournment (9:25 – 9:30 PM)**
- a. October – November 2018: No DPAC meetings anticipated, consultant drafting specific plan.
 - b. December 13, 2018 DPAC meeting (results of outreach in September, status of key topics in draft Specific Plan).
 - c. The meeting was adjourned at 9:47 pm.

In compliance with Brown Act regulations, this agenda was legally posted at least 72 hours in advance of the listed meeting date. Any writing related to an agenda item for this meeting distributed to the Committee less than 72 hours before this meeting will be available online at <http://cityofdavis.org/city-hall/commissions-and-committees/core-area-advisory-committee> and will also be available for review at the Committee meeting. For additional information regarding this agenda or this committee, please feel free to contact Bob Wolcott, email rwolcott@cityofdavis.org or telephone (530) 757-5610.

The City does not transcribe its proceedings. Anyone who desires a verbatim record of this meeting should arrange for attendance by a court reporter or for other acceptable means of recordation. Such arrangements will be at the sole expense of the individual requesting the recordation.

*Agenda - Downtown Davis Plan Advisory Committee Meeting
September 20, 2018*

As required by the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special assistance to access the facility or to otherwise participate at this meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, should contact the City Manager's Office at 530-757-5602. Notification at least 24 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to the meeting.