



Meeting Minutes

City of Davis

Downtown Davis Plan Advisory Committee Meeting

Senior Center Activity Room, 646 A Street

Thursday, March 15, 2018

7:00 P.M.

Committee Members:	Meg Arnold (Chair), Michelle Byars (Vice Chair), Catherine Brinkley, Judy Corbett, Josh Chapman, Ryan Dodge, Cheryl Essex, Matt Dulcich, Justin Goss, Chris Granger, Larry Guenther, Rob Hofmann, Darren McCaffrey, John Meyer, Sinisa Novakovic, Eric Roe, Deema Tamimi, Rob White, Randy Yackzan
Absent:	Mary DeWall
City Staff:	Bob Wolcott, Diane Parro
Consultants:	Dan Parolek and Mitali Ganguly (Opticos Design), Gladys Cornell and Isabelle Gaillard (AIM)

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

- The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m.
- Meg welcomed the DPAC committee members.
- All committee members present except Mary DeWall

2. Approval of Agenda

- Meg explains committee can offer thoughts and answer questions to the consulting team. It will be a more interactive meeting tonight.
- Meg asks the Committee to accept the agenda. Motion by Rob White, seconded by Larry Guenther. The agenda is approved by consensus.

3. Approval of Minutes

- Meg asks the Committee to approve the draft minutes of February 15, 2018. Motion by Rob White, seconded by Judy Corbett. The minutes are approved by consensus.

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

- a. No announcements

5. Presentation on Existing Conditions, Dan Parolek of Opticos, Inc.

- a. Opticos gives a presentation of the current work status and dates on the updated Existing Conditions analysis. Dan presents on key findings, and request questions and discussion from the DPAC.
 - i. Encourages committee to think big.
 - ii. The summary of key findings will be emailed to the DPAC and uploaded to the project website on March 8th, 2018.
 - iii. Existing Conditions Report will be available for download next week.

DPAC Comments on Presentation Above

- b. Chris Granger: We haven't seen the underlying documents. If there is inaccuracy or missing content, how do we address that?
Dan Parolek: Inaccuracies should be corrected, but we can address that if there is need to change.
Meg Arnold: Maybe provide underlying documents when available and provide additional review by email. At the next meeting, it can be available to see and review. Sounds like we will have until April 19 to review and provide comments.
Bob Wolcott: We should make a preliminary decision, I'll compile any comments and provide that back for the April 19th meeting. Maybe DPAC comments an addendum.
John Meyer: Errors should be considered.
Meg Arnold: Our responsibility – provide priority feedback.
Mitali Ganguly: Economic study will also be available week before the meeting
Meg Arnold: Send priority comments by April 2. Staff will summarize, consultants can view it. We will include those as an addendum.
Chris Granger: Anything that can be changed easily should be.
Michelle: Everyone say your comments now.
- c. Cheryl Essex: I have a couple questions on the chapter summaries. 2.21 Summary – 10 acres in Downtown are owned by the City. What are those?
On Chapter 3.3 Summary: Financially productive? What does that mean?
Mitali Ganguly: Financially productive refers to the Value Per Acre Analysis technique that is tied to property and sales tax. This analysis reveals the unrealized potential of the value of the land. Urban 3 will come back and dive deep into that study.
Cheryl Essex: Are you suggesting that areas with parking are not financially productive? And 5-story buildings are?
Dan Parolek: Urban development has higher financial returns for the City.
- d. John Meyer: Well done, the summary is a good product. The document says that in the Downtown census there are 1,000 residents in the study area. That number does not seem accurate. I think it needs a better definition.
- e. Ryan Dodge: We are accepting everything is correct, I would like to see documentation you used so we can see the methodology.
- f. Randy Yackzan: The language used in the summary is confusing. Are you saying once downtown is developed, it is more valuable for the city? A key issue in developing downtown, is parking. When we had redevelopment dollars, we were

required to build a parking structure. Rent is high, we don't have help from the redevelopment agencies and with high construction and material costs, it's challenging to build a parking structure.

Eric Roe: So do we reduce city fees? Provide less parking and parking in-lieu fees?

- g. Larry Guenther: Will we change the study area? Where is the center of the center? Perhaps the E Street Plaza, but it's half parking. We need to identify which buildings we want to save. I like the term you used "human-centered" – Davis is people.
- h. Rob White: What's the universe of the possible. It's good to dream big, but need to be realistic. As rents rise, it's less of a reality to have the businesses we have been asking for.
- i. Justin Goss: In the micro-economic section - 3.3. we observed a lot of parking lots, but the document says there aren't many parking lots.
- j. Eric Roe: Downtown Davis has too many small parcels. Owners ask for a lot of money. You get a better economy of scale if your property is larger. There are redevelopment opportunities, but the City needs to give incentives.
- k. Darren McCaffrey: Parking minimums as opposed to maximums. Design constraints on builders. Thank you for the summary, it was enjoyable to read. The boundary: what benefits or drawbacks are there for neighborhoods being lumped into downtown? Is there a way to have an on-going email discussion?

Public Comment

- l. Rhonda Reed: We need more dialogue on the boundaries to understand why the boundaries are where they are. Prop 13 changes analysis completely.
- m. Eric Gudz: Thank you for your continued work.

6. Presentation on Community Outreach Update, Gladys Cornell of AIM Consulting (7:49 PM)

- a. AIM presents a summary description of the community outreach events to date, results of the outreach and methods of analyzing the collected data.
 - i. Call to action to committee to assist in outreach. They are partners.
 - ii. Concerns – interesting info from the feedback?

DPAC Comments on Presentation Above

- b. Darren McCaffrey: Mid-20s to mid-30s demographic has not existed here in a long time.
- c. Judy Corbett: We are creating a vision. It would be helpful to brief people on what those options might be. Community image survey: it gives pictures and asks people what they like and why. Communities that do a good job at creating a downtown have a slogan. Envision Davis? Get people feeling like they are contributing to the process. People do not know what a design charrette is.
- d. Josh Chapman: Business owners are not familiar with the plan. We suggest Sunday evenings.
- e. Chris Granger: We are missing the other voice of the natural environment. How do we bring more green into the space? How do we build it into the conversation?

Maybe we make a tool that encourages the community to walk around and observe what we observed on our walking tour.

- f. Michelle Byars: Everyone is concerned about downtown businesses – how do we reach the businesses? Have we talked to owners, versus renters, versus land owners? Please send us information on the upcoming events.
- g. Sinisa Novakovic: 90% of the University Avenue area is single family residential. It is very different from the core and should not be included in the study.
- h. John Meyer: Hands on workshop, we want your involvement – charrette is not a clear term.
- i. Michelle Byars: The term “pop-up” also confused people.
- j. Justin Goss: I saw the flyers downtown, they look good. We need to encourage transportation questions. This is about level of parking, what we can do with and without. Could you live with less parking?

Public Comment

- k. Cathy Forkas: Use Nextdoor more often.
- l. Mary Jo-Bryan: Elderly love the downtown but don't come downtown. We have purchase power. Please concentrate a little more on this. Maybe separate questions and answers at the pop-up workshops by age group.
- m. Margarite: Visual images – virtual reality. Can we make the concepts more tangible? More transportation-oriented questions – can we ask about how downtown should change for pedestrians, cars, bikes?

7. Presentation and Discussion on Charrette #1 – Design Themes, Dan Parolek of Opticos Inc.

- a. The consultant team discusses preliminary Design Themes based on the results of the community outreach and existing conditions analysis. These Design themes will help to structure the development of plan alternatives during the upcoming 4.5 day design charrette to be held on April 24 through 28, 2018.
- b. The consultant team would also like to discuss roles and responsibilities of the DPAC at the upcoming charrette, as well as answer any questions that the DPAC may have on the ‘What to Expect at the Charrette’ presentation that was presented at the February 15th DPAC meeting. Topics for discussion can include: DPAC roles and attendance times, public presentations, brown bag lunchtime information sessions, public interaction, and studio times.
- c. City staff explains that Tuesday opening and Saturday closing presentations are being considered “community meetings” and the Thursday mid-point presentation is being considered a DPAC meeting to allow interaction. The discussion will help finalize the charrette components.

DPAC Comments on Presentation Above

- d. Larry Guenther: Resilient – We don't know where transportation or retail is going right now. They have changed drastically. They are still vibrant because they are going places you want to go. Placemaking as a resilient matter.
- e. Meg Arnold: I'd like to make a request for action to the DPAC – we need to get the word out about the charrettes. We need good turnout. This is our duty to help

the City and get the word out. If you are here on behalf of an organization, send out charrette information out to the membership.

- f. John Meyer: Can we have a tool from the consultants? Messaging, links,
- g. Chris Granger: The school district distributes flyers by backpack.
- h. Deema Tamimi: Flyers need to be translated into Spanish. Put flyers in the buses. What's the protocol with emailing each other in the DPAC?
- i. Bob Wolcott: You can do an informational piece to everyone, but there cannot be interaction or it becomes a substitute for a public meeting. That would be a violation of Brown Act.
- j. Deema Tamimi: Can you send us information about all public outreach strategies? A hashtag would help.
- k. Catherine Brinkley: Need to get an initial buy-in from folks – let's ask them a question when we alert them about the events. That way we gather information from those who cannot make the event.
- l. Darren McCaffrey: Could we email each other if we post the content of the emails online?
- m. Bob Wolcott: Statements of opinion and information are okay. Interaction becomes a public meeting.
- n. Chris Granger: Can we use Nextdoor?
- o. Randy Yackzan: There is more desire to talk. Can it be an agenda item for the next meeting? I want to discuss the boundaries.
- p. Ryan Dodge: I make a motion that we have a meeting without an agenda, or at least the agenda item is discussion.
The motion was seconded by a DPAC member.
- q. Bob Wolcott: Our agendas need to have discussion topics at least.
- r. Eric Roe: I read everyone's homework and now I want to discuss it. Let's get together in little groups?
- s. Meg Arnold: Conversation is good, but two hours of utterly unstructured is challenging.
- t. Darren McCaffrey: Can we put on the agenda items that keep coming up? Like the boundary, individual visions.
- u. Meg Arnold: We can structure meeting how we would like to structure them. This needs to be set up thoughtfully so the discussion can accomplish something. I would like to offer an alternate motion: The committee would like the opportunity for a substantial portion of a future meeting to permit the possibility of working conversations on a range of recurring topics.
- v. Ryan Dodge: I withdraw my motion.
- w. Cheryl Essex: What about during charrette week? Maybe the committee gets a 2 or 3 hour block during the open studio. The public can come.
- x. John Meyer: Do we want it before the charrette? So it has influence?
- y. Meg Arnold: The process of the charrette is to take all input as it comes and have it reflected in the closing ceremony, correct? Perhaps we request that staff and consultants identify the best means for the DPAC to gather at a specific set time in the early phase of the charrette. Not a closed session, but that we have the opportunity to get more hands on with the material and all be there at the same time.

- z. Dan Parolek: That's a good idea, but I'm not sure it takes the place of what's necessary to just dive into your homework. I like it at the charrette, but it sounds like you want to do more before the charrette.
- aa. Judy Corbett: I also feel like there have been ideas for further outreach that we need to discuss more.
- bb. Chris Granger: We need to talk more about innovation and transportation. I'm working on two planning projects that are related to solutions for the Amtrak station. Perhaps we need an agenda call. Make sure we are all on the same page.
- cc. Dan Parolek: I don't think we need to be there for the conversation.
- dd. Rob White: Harriet (our city attorney) rules that all meetings need to abide by Brown Act. Because we are not a decision-making body, maybe we have more meetings. We do not need to have a quorum. You can have meetings just have a dialogue. We can request that.
- ee. Bob Wolcott: A quorum is 8 of our members, so technically 7 can meet, but it may have the appearance of a public meeting.
- ff. Meg Arnold: We have several weeks between now and the charrette, maybe we have early set of hours for DPAC participation time. Between now and the charrette, perhaps we have more meetings. (Meg conducts informal tally – "Would you come to those? A majority thumbs-up)
- gg. Randy Yackzan: It's hard to schedule meetings – could Opticos provide time? Perhaps at the next meeting?
- hh. Dan Parolek: The next meeting will go over feedback on existing conditions and the economic analysis of downtown.
- ii. Chris Granger: One thought is to add time to the existing meeting structure. Do it all as a conversation?
- jj. Bob Wolcott: I have this room available every week at 7:00 p.m. I need Dan to comment on changes to charrette schedule.
We need to explain what the community is physically doing during the open studio.
- kk. Dan Parolek: We will have greeters at the door who can direct the community where to go during the charrette. This will be held at the Davis Community Church.
- ll. Meg Arnold: We had a motion that reflected DPAC time in the early part of the charrette schedule. It would not turn the studio into closed studio. We can gather together to discuss more tangible items. Opticos will present to DPAC at the mid-point on Thursday. This would meet the objective of the motion that is on the table. Does this Thursday time-frame work? [Opticos will take a day to think about this idea.]
- mm. Eric Roe: I propose it being 7:00-9:00 instead of 6:00-7:00. 6:00 is dinner time.
- nn. Bob Wolcott: Whatever time frame, the committee will have more to discuss after seeing something come out of the charrette.
- oo. Dan Parolek: We hope to see DPAC members before this Thursday meeting.
- pp. Darren McCaffrey: What are the notice requirements for holding a meeting?
- qq. Bob Wolcott: Once it's noticed, 72 hours in advance, it needs to be a quorum to call it an official meeting and allow for interaction.

- rr. Michelle Byars: I heard that we want to have more discussion during our already set meetings. Our next meeting is substantive. I don't know if that's do-able for our next meeting. Maybe a 6:00 p.m. start?
- ss. Randy Yackzan: Can we extend the next meeting by 30 minutes? Motion to move meeting from 7:00 – 9:30 p.m. All in favor. No opposed, no abstain. The next meeting will be from 7:00 – 9:30 p.m.
- tt. Meg Arnold: We would like the posters, verbiage and a tool kit to equip us to talk to others about the charrette.
- uu. Larry Guenther: Half hour doesn't seem enough.

8. General Public Comments (8:30 PM)

No public comment.

9. Other Committee and Staff Communications (8:50 PM)

DPAC Comments

Michelle Byars: Change website to be clearer.

10. Next DPAC Meeting Date and Adjournment (9:24 PM)

The consultants and staff will describe the next DPAC meeting date of April 19, 2018. Anticipated items include Economic and Market Analysis summary report and final preparations for charrette on April 24 – 28.

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 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.

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.