

SUMMARY MINUTES

City of Davis General Plan/ Housing Element Update Steering Committee

2500 Fifth Street, Police Department Community Room

May 31, 2007

7:00 P.M.

Committee Members: Lucas Frerichs, Pam Gunnell, Eileen Samitz, Ellen Shields, Mark Siegler (Vice Chair), Maynard Skinner, Mark Spencer, Norma Turner, Bob Traverso, Luke Watkins, Donna Lott, Kristen Stoneking, Kevin Wolf (Chair).

Absent: Mike Harrington, Jay Gerber

Staff: Bob Wolcott, Danielle Foster

Consultant: Jeff Baird

1. Roll Call, Call the Meeting to Order.

Kevin Wolf called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

2. Approval of Agenda.

Bob Traverso asked for clarification of the June 28th meeting for the committee.

Kevin Wolf made the motion to approve the agenda; the rest of the committee was in favor of that motion.

3. Approval of Summary Minutes for April 17, 2007.

Mark Siegler ask that his and Kevin Wolf's names be added related to the Community Workshop #1 as working at the Orientation Station. With this amendment, the minutes were approved unanimously.

4. Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

5. Review Community Workshop #1.

Jeff Baird asked that the committee members give their input as to what worked and what did not in regards to the May 24 General Plan/ Housing update Open House.

The Committee had the following comments:

- Norma Turner congratulated staff on the hard work they did putting together this outreach.
- Bob Traverso thought the dots (used to prioritize important factors when considering creating new housing developments) were very constructive. He continued by saying that it was an effective method to have a quantitative study of public input.
- Many of the other members agreed that although the dots had positive aspects there were too many of them and people were getting confused as to how many could be used for each factor. This may have skewed the data some.
- Another critique of the open house was that the listed factors were vague and often hard to understand. They were both written in positives and negatives and the committee members themselves had a difficult time understanding what all the statements alluded to. Mark Siegler stated that the way it was written did not make sense and could bias the response. Donna said that the terms were not specific enough but that the sticky notes were good because it allowed people to say exactly what they meant.
- Pam Gunnell added that questions on the factors at the workshop could be answered by looking up the source document of the factor: General Plan, Council goals, or SACOG Smart Growth Principles.
- Eileen Samitz thought a positive aspect of the event was that it was an open house; people could drop in at their leisure and not have to feel as though they had to stay for a certain time period. This made the event very accessible.
- Bob Wolcott raised the question of whether it would be better to do an open house for the next public outreach meeting or perhaps small group discussions instead, depending upon content of the workshop.

Other general comments were:

- Workshop increased Committee Member's familiarity with factors
- Format allowed people to be heard and accommodated families or people with tight schedules
- Format also allowed for one-on-one discussions
- The Committee was grateful for staff's summary of the workshop and its information, but requested a tally of the red dots placed within each factor category.

Suggestions of improvements for the next workshop:

- Provide a large print of "quick" workshop directions at the entrance.
- Improve clarity of factors or whatever relative workshop information.
- Continue to provide multiple feedback option to the public (post-its, comment sheets, etc.)
- Continue to accept and allow all comments "to be" without judgment

- Continue to provide information at the workshops, including information about University and County growth and jurisdictions, relative to the City

The Committee requested a tally of the red dots placed within each of the factors categories at the workshop. Here is that summary:

Category	Red Dot Amount
Community Resources and Environmental Health 8 factors total	131
Community Economy and Fiscal Stability/Health 7 factors total	64
Community Facilities and Services (Infrastructure, Mobility and Public Safety) 10 factors total	142
Community Form, Land Use and Housing 10 factors total	160

Note: Not all factors in each category received red dots, but staff wanted to provide information regarding the number of factors in each category.

6. Finalize Working Draft of Site Worksheet.

Many of the members were concerned about the amount of paper used to create these 13 page worksheets because it would be a lot of information to go through and also a lot of staff time. Bob Traverso said that there was perhaps too much information in the packets and that staff should consider changing it so that it employs broader concepts instead of specific ones. Maynard Skinner raised another point when he asked if the committee or staff knew if the properties being considered have owners who are interested in developing their land for housing. Jeff Baird explained that the worksheet was a tool so that the committee would have all the information the needed to make their decisions. Kevin Wolf believes that staff should try to make their information as factual as possible.

Another concern was the final page of the worksheet, development and potential issues. Committee members were divided on whether or not staff should be filling out the back page or if the Committee should. Mark Spencer thought it would be beneficial to have the staff fill out at least the major entitlements/ processing commitment portion so that the committee could “know how many hoops they would have to jump through” in order to get things approved. Along with this section they wanted staff to add the ability to meet RHNA or the 1% Growth Policy. One Committee member also expressed that he would prefer the back page of the worksheet to be on the front.

7. Finalize Working Draft List of Potential Sites

As a result of feedback from the Community Workshop #1, the Haussler property on East Covell and the properties south of city limits on the east side of the Solano County border were added to the map and the Working List of Potential Housing

Sites. Staff stated that to be fair to the purpose of this process the committee should be considering all potential sites, including potential sites outside of existing city limits. Bob Traverso stated that consideration of some sites does not make sense and is a waste of time. Bob Wolcott explained that staff was including all potential sites on the Working List of Potential Sites in order to complete the comprehensive review that the City Council directed of the Steering Committee. Many other Steering Committee members expressed concern at considering such a wide range of sites outside of city limits. Kevin Wolf suggested that a discussion on the deletion of potential sites without review of a Site Worksheet be added to an upcoming agenda. There was consensus from the Committee to schedule this discussion.

8. Review and confirm “Project Process” and “Near-Term Meetings and Schedule.”

The Committee added meetings to the near-term schedule and submitted information regarding their upcoming vacation schedules. Staff will revise the near-term schedule to reflect these changes.

9. Bus Tour of the Potential Housing Sites.

This item was removed from the agenda however, the committee did agree that the bus tour should be cancelled and that members could visit sites on their own based on their own need and desire. It was requested that notice be given to committee members regarding which sites are estimated to be discussed at each meeting so that the committee members could be prepared for considering the sites.

10. Written Communications.

There were no written communications.

11. Check-in and Preparation for Future Agendas.

The draft agenda for the June 14, 2007 meeting was supported, without additional changes.

12. Adjournment, Next Scheduled Meeting Date.

Maynard moved to adjourn the meeting and Pam Gunnell seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 9:18.