

COUNCIL COMMITTEE MINUTES

Concurrent Special Committee Meetings of the Sacramento City Council, Redevelopment Agency of the City of Sacramento, Housing Authority of the City of Sacramento and the Parking Authority of the City of Sacramento.

Transportation & Community

COMMITTEE NAME: Development Community

MEETING DATE: February 22, 1994

MEETING TIME: 11:00 a.m.

LOCATION: 915 I STREET, 2ND FLOOR, COUNCIL CHAMBER

VOTING RECORD LEGEND

MOV: MOVED	ABST: ABSTAIN
SEC: SECOND	ABS: ABSENT
M — MAYOR RUDIN	D5 — SERNA
D1 — FARGO	D6 — MUELLER
D2 — FERRIS	D7 — KASTANIS
D3 — PANE	D8 — ROBIE
D4 — CHINN	

I HEREBY CALL Special Meetings of the Sacramento City Council, Redevelopment Agency of the City of Sacramento, Housing Authority of the City of Sacramento, and Parking Authority of the City of Sacramento to be conducted concurrently with the Council committee meetings listed below, which are incorporated herein by reference. The Special Meetings are called to permit Members who are not on the listed committees to attend the meetings and participate in the discussions. In the event five (5) or more members of the City Council are present at a Committee meeting, only those items listed on the agenda can be acted on or discussed.

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m. by Chair Jimmy Yee. No roll was called. The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Yee (Chair), Fargo, Kastanis, Kerth, Pane

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ortiz, Steinberg, Pannell

ALSO PRESENT:

1. D which was prepared and
pl ty, Sacramento.

R

C

R

V

Joyce WOLF

X 7750

city councilmembers will
neighborhoods asking for

with results to the joint
e Design Review.

only, no vote needed

Transp
February 22, 1994
Page 1 of 1

MINUTES:

Committee member Steve Peterson, Planning Department, introduced Christy Jensen, a professor at Sacramento State University, who provided findings and conclusions of her report on some of the studies that have been completed for the Central City. This was by the way of background. The Planning Commission is on a Review Board of a joint meeting on Peoples February 3, where they also heard Professor Jensen's report, and they requested that a second meeting be scheduled for March 3, 1994. This meeting (February 22, 1994) is the twelfth meeting of the Design and Review Board of the City's Planning Commission. At this follow-up meeting on March 3, 1994, further comments and recommendations will be given to the Student Council on this report. This will allow a little more time to review the contents of the report. Steve Peterson's department will also make a staff report to the Planning Commission as well as the Review Board at the March 3 meeting.

Committee member Yee inquired if the Planning Department has looked into the list of studies that have been reviewed, and are they prepared to make a comment as to whether they have, in fact, been implemented?

Committee member Steve Peterson answered affirmatively, and that his committee will be responding to all of the comments in Christy Jensen's report, prior to the March 13 Planning Commission, and will look at this in more detail, intend to provide a full status report and explanation of what the status is of all those things at that time.

Committee member Yee asked if they are prepared now to have Christy Jensen speak?

Steve Peterson answered affirmatively and asked if one of his committee members wanted to add anything.

Another Planning Department member explained that they are prepared today, verbally, to discuss the status of these reports with the Planning Commission, but they thought it appropriate for the Planning Commission to also come back with a report at a later date.

Christy Jensen, Professor and Director of the Graduate Program of the Public Policy of the Administration at CSUS, thanked the committee for the opportunity to speak.

She explained that they are a program that is about five years old and has about 90 graduate students now, with almost 20 finished thesis and projects. Most of their students are working in state and local government, in the legislature, in the executive branch and in planning agencies at the city/county level.

This study was developed and completed by two of their graduate students with Ms. Jensen's supervision and it came out of the work they had done with the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency three years ago. They had looked at scattered sized housing vs high density concentrated housing in the downtown area. In the course of the study they became very interested in local downtown planning and land use issues. They are interested in neighbor elected official and city management links and how communication and decision making occurs. She emphasized that they did not approach this as planners so our goal is not to take the thirteen studies and critique them of terms of the wisdom of the planning concepts of the planning decisions. Our interest was really in the issue of communication and participation. The way the study proceeded was they looked at these thirteen studies which represented a variety of efforts by different agencies. Some private consultants, some students, and some city staff did the work over a twelve-year period. Those studies that were looked at are listed in Appendix A, on the second page of the document. Then they took those studies and set up a frame work that you see in that private study, in which they looked at each of the studies in terms of date completed, the agency responsible, and tried to identify who the consultant was, if it was a private consultant, what kind of Citizen Committee was involved with the plan federation. They looked at the cost of the study to them in terms of private consultant fees. All of this was completed by City staff. They weren't able to access a direct cost, and tried to determine council action. They had a summary of the study and tried to identify the current status. The students tried to look for files, talking with City Staff. The methodology was conversations and document review.

Essentially, they determined at the conclusion of reviewing those thirteen documents that there were errors that they thought needed attention of three major areas. What they call communication of leadership, which was in the area of council communication to neighborhoods, staff communication and visa versa. In other words, the whole issue of Citizen understanding of what happens to these studies.

Professor Jensen said that one of the biggest things that Citizens feel is when these studies are done Citizens aren't clear about what action is taken and not clear about the status of these studies. Citizens feel that they fall into a black whole and then decisions are made by the council and the Citizens don't know how those decisions relate to previous plans or studies or actions that were taken. She also explained that communication and leadership was one area. The second area was coordination. They identified issues in which Regional Transit, SHRA and the city might not have been coordinating and communicating at studies. The third, and last issue, was internal administration. The issue of internal tracking systems, internal filing systems. Things she thought, essentially relate to internal assignment and organization of the responsibilities. The three areas: are communication, leadership, administration and coordination.

The Administration issue was that there were not single locations in any city department where reference copies of the studies were. There were no comprehensive lists of the consultants in the

contract fees that were paid per study. There didn't appear to be any kind of formal tracking system which provided easily retrievable information as to the status and assignment, nor a follow-through responsibilities, so that a member of the council or Citizen Group could find out at a point in time, what was happening to a particular study.

Professor Jensen's study found that there was a feeling that in terms of coordination between city council and planning staff that sometimes the city council was not, on a regular basis, requesting status updates on a kind of tickler file system of some kind of routine regularized reporting system.

One of the most dramatic likeness systems they had a really difficult time was in ascertaining total costs of the various studies. Again, because of the lack of this kind of information.

They made recommendations about past and future procedures. In terms of past procedures, the feeling was that a lot of work and a lot of money had been expended on those thirteen studies for the last number of years and that some time ought to be spent on looking at what is salvageable from those studies. It needs to be determined what is the status, what is workable and usable information out of those studies that Planning Commissions and Council should be aware of regarding those studies.

In terms of the future they feel that some sort of computerized centralized tracking and filing system would be helpful to both the City Manager, the Mayor, and the Councilmembers and the Planning Commission members, as well as data. A filing system should allow retrieval of common elements of the file. The Mayor and the Council should review and set priorities on a semi or annual basis regarding the status of studies and their implementation. They believe that an accounting system established which would provide information on the accumulation of expenditures of future studies. These are not listed in the initial contract costs associated with the study but they are called BIR costs. The Councilmembers should know at any point in time how much any particular study is costing.

Professor Jensen asked for any questions or an overview. Again, their interest was not in commenting on the substance from a planning standpoint as much as from a communication internal organization standpoint.

Committee member Yee thanked Professor Jensen for her presentation and said he feels a little sympathetic toward what she was saying and explained that not too long ago he had to call Planning to find out the status of previous studies regarding the river front, and related the similarities of what has been done in the past in this area. He explained that the Central City should have some kind of central tracking system, a filing system where the City can go back and retrieve some of this information and where convenient process of information.

Professor Jensen stated that one final point she wanted to emphasize that their attempt was not in anyway to be critical of individuals because the expertise among the individuals and what they had in their head, and their own filing system was incredible.

Committee member Yee said that one of the problems is that no one is here for forever and filing systems should not be kept in someone's head.

Committee member, Terry Kastanis, asked Professor Jensen from her prospective, where she thought this communication should emulate and explained that the City Clerk's office has the responsibility for the Public Record which is central. Each Department is independent to the extent that they have their own staff, their own department, their own computers, and their own data systems.

Also, there is the public library that suffers from the lack of staff to do that kind of tracking and keeping that kind of information.

He asked a second multiple question, did she think that information is readily available to the public regarding these studies? Were they easy to find, did you duplicate them, were there any restrictions in finding them?

Professor Jensen responded to the second question first by saying that it was difficult to get their hands on things, because there was no easy place to go and say, "I want a copy of this kind of study". If you followed the lead of a staff member who had previously done a study, and when you go to him/her you will find it. You will eventually find things through the informal system, but for a citizen, there was no centralized place.

Committee member, Terry Kastanis, said that to counteract, one of the issues he has asked the Library Staff to look at is for the Library Staff to discuss with the Library Board, (the Library Board will be meeting again next month) which is the joint authority system for the County, to find a way to find they would have a policy within the City and the County. Every single document, published by public money would have an adduce on the back of the title page that said that this document, this study was generated with public money, there is no copyright, you are encouraged to duplicate and disseminate this information making it available. This method is 180 degrees from what we normally do. We normally pick up a document and say that this is restrictive, not to be copied. He feels that something different should be done with public money as apposed to many of these documents. Committee member Terry Kastanis asked, that if this was the case would this help in any way? Would they be more available if there was a policy that said duplicate these Public documents?

Professor Jensen answered by saying that certainly that would help matters, but part of the matter is some sort of a central qualifications which is more than making copies.

One of the men of the study members spoke about issues saying that the Library Department is in terrible disarray and that one of the things they found from this report is that it focuses on the difficulty for the layman in these matters. And frankly, for your staff, to see this list of these thirteen reports that were analyzed that Steve, Art, and himself can give the status of most of these reports. Just from memory and from working with them, but it doesn't mean that it is all clear to the person on the street. The study member explained that they know that there is a relationship between the Central City Plan, the General Plan, the Urban Design Plan, or the study. From our point of view, those things are all closely related. He explained that one of the things that would be very helpful, that the Commission suggested, is that as each of these reports come out we maintain a comprehensive summary. If you want to know what is going on in Central City, these are the documents you should be looking at. These are how the subsequent documents were intended to amend the meter documents to be the Central City Community Plan.

They can derive much of this information from this. Years ago when everything was grant funded, one of the conditions of the grant was that inside the front cover would be a summary and an abstract of the report which would include other reports that this related to. This would be very helpful. For example: The Alhambra Corridor a person could easily find its status of documents which are recorded.

Sharon Cox commented that they are going to the neighborhood committee the first part of March with proposed organizational changes. One of the things they recognized and will present to that was much better coordination, annual update, and compilation of all of the documents in the City. One of the proposals there is organization and suggest that the Council review and update their plans once a year, which would include not only the Central City but plans room for all of the Central City and follows on very nicely to a number of points raised in this study for City Plans only. That whole review is scheduled to go on to the Folsom Council in terms of some organizational changes, which will be about the third week in March.

Committee member Heather Fargo, regarding yet another Central City event we were kicking off the starting of the downtown partnership this morning and unfortunately that conflicted with the starting of this meeting, which points out one of the problems of the Central City. She felt that this study is very helpful, because it gives them a starting place. Part of her concern was that they were focusing on making sure that people have access to documents, which seemed to her, like the really easy part of this problem. This relates to Central, it is not a problem as it relates to South Sacramento studies there, North Sacramento, South Natomas or any other part of the City. The next step is to look at the actual coordination of the documents and the follow-through on the consultant studies and whether or not they want to do that or not.

Committee member Heather Fargo continued saying it seems that Council should ask its staff to look at this study and come back with their recommendations for how we address the recommendations here. This clearly goes beyond, where are the documents found? Get to the point where we find that some reports are not a priority, or they are not a concern and they need to be taken off of the list, it was something that money was spent on, but Council is not going to follow through. In other cases plans are held near and dear to their hearts, dreams, and vision for Central City and would like to see move forward. We need to get staff reaction.

No one was seen from the Neighborhood Department and a big part of what goes on in the Central City are neighborhoods. One of the conflicts between what goes wrong in the Central City is conflict between our very vibrant downtown and the neighborhoods that we all want to save and preserve. Will Central City be considered as not a neighborhood and therefore Neighborhood Services Department services is not involved or should someone from the Neighborhood Services Department into this mix of deciding how these recommendations are dealt with. The City needs to now decide what to do with this study. It shouldn't be the end.

One Committee member agreed with Committee member Heather Fargo and asked if the study group will come back to this particular committee and address these issues again.

The Study member who spoke earlier addressed this question by reiterating what Mr. C. Peterson's opening remarks were. The Client mission and the Design Review Board had a joint meeting and among other things covered this report of Professor Jensen's report on February 3, 1994. And they have asked to have a second joint meeting to consider recommendations to the Council on the contents of this report which will be on March 3. The Neighborhood Department is not interested or was excluded because this meeting was pulled together haphazardly.

Committee member, Terry Kastanis, asked if the report would come to City Council or to the Planning Committee, and it was decided that the study would come back to the Planning Committee.

Committee member, Josh Pane, made a few comments thanking Professor Jensen and her student's work on this study and agreed that it is a good study. He read through it thoroughly and believes it helps and puts it into prospective. It does something since he has been associated with the City since 1992 that he has wanted to see.

He felt that this Planning Committee or a special committee of the three members that represent the Central City should be assigned this task and focus on this task. The joint committees will come back and give their recommendation.

There was talk about SHRA Design Review and Planning Commission, and there was talk at one time of two members each serving on a committee just for the Central City. He asked what the status is of that.

Sharon Cox answered that proposal has never been formally put together or presented, at this time, to any City Council committee.

Committee member, Josh Pane, wanted to know who originated this idea.

Sharon Cox answered SHRA. That the Planning Commission has had a couple discussions relative to that and have had a joint meeting Redevelopment Commission and the Planning Commission, in conversations with me expressed the study members concerns about that approach.

Committee member, Josh Pane, explained that several years ago a commission decided that this study would be an on-going thing, cutting through the need to go to the Redevelopment Commission, the Planning Commission, the Design Review so as to make something go.

He gave an example of a four-unit condominium was built and designed beautifully on 24th and L Streets, which was three stories and a very nice addition for the neighborhood. That had tremendous problems getting through the Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Commission. They also had a water problem. Some focus might be necessary to move these smaller problems through more quickly, because when a small builder on a small piece of land that the builder wants to do something nice with, it is difficult to get through this mechanism which is set up. The water problem he spoke of was that the Water Department wanted them to bring water in from the alley rather than connect from the street and this was going to cost another \$40,000. Spreading \$40,000 over four units was not going to make it. They finally compromised and went out to the street, but those are types of problems besides the Commission structure, there are other problems.

Committee member Heather Fargo said that the example used gets at a different issue which is their issue, and this is infill, and how are we going to treat infill projects. This is a City-wide problem and not just a Central City issue. She is not as excited about the idea of not having Design Review as well as the different commissions review on Central City projects. She did not see that this slowed down projects that much and feels like they have been able to expedite and streamline projects.

Committee member, Josh Pane, gave another example, of Mr. and Mrs. Luffingwell on C Street off of 25th, went through a Design Review and these people wanted to do the right thing for Central City, moved to Central City, and they are not getting response. What they are getting is layer upon layer and finally decided not to do a \$125,000 project. That's the bottom line.

Committee member Heather Fargo had one point to make which are a number of changes underway that this report bares out as being needed. There are a number of organization changes underway, the formation of the Neighborhood Department, the combination of Utilities, Public Works, and Planning. They will consolidate all permitting at one location, the issues of the Downtown Partnership in relationship to existing commissions, the creation of the zoning administrator, and perhaps more moving permanent activity downward. She agreed that Councilmember, Josh Pane, brings out a good issue that they need to keep in mind as they are looking at these possible changes. Should be aware of all of these, and try to look at what they want to do in the context of all changes so they don't create a can of worms from the old can of worms, but really straighten out, so that when they meet again March 3, 1994, see how the issues brought up in this report fit in with the other things that are going on.

Committee member Rob Kerth, would like to say more about infill in the long run. Central City gets some very nice projects; however, he has not had the benefit of a lot of nice infill projects. He asked Professor Jensen to expand on how they use Citizen Panels.

Professor Jensen said that when a Citizen's Panel is put together that represents diverse interests, which is what you want. Strong leadership training is needed for these groups or you can get paralysis, or majority/minority reports which then beg the question of not doing things unless it is necessary. In constructing these type of committees attention needs to be paid to leadership in these committees, in terms of the kinds of skills that are necessary to help groups arrive at consciences. An investment in the process is worth doing.

Committee member Heather Fargo said that it is a mystery where some of the reports are, and Committee member Rob Kerth agreed.

Make sure that they develop a short paper that explains the status of the various Plans in the Central City and the various other cities.

Projects are undertaken in the Planning realm that have a lot of variety and people work on them for quite awhile and they seem to disappear. One of these that we are asked a lot about is Housing Policy that came forth in Council, and the Council declined to adopt it. This is about the most difficult decision to adopt. We still have many people in the community who worked on this. So there is difficulty in finding some of these projects.

Committee member, Terry Kastanis stated that he being the only Councilmember at this meeting who has been a part of all of these studies. He addressed Chairman Yee, saying that what he would like to see the Committee do is ask staff to look at this in two ways. He agreed that Diane is absolutely correct that the Central City is in a transition period to be able to get a handle on things. He feels that a separation should be made of access to studies and access to information

not just to Central Cities throughout the entire city. That they should come up with ideas as to how to access that data and separate it from the actual results of the content of those studies. Because that is what is going to be influenced by the political process, by the economy, and by all kinds of things. They cannot control, necessarily. They can get a handle on the access information. They can track and find out how much has been done. These are definable.

The other part that is difficult to get a handle on is "What do we want to do with the information? Do we want to change it, the new Mayor, and on and on. This is what we cannot deal with as a Committee or Staff at this point." There is good information from this study about accessing information, how to track it, who has the responsibility.

Committee member Yee felt that with regard to changes to the study should not be made and whatever the results are will be what there is to live with. If changes need to be made then another study will need to be done.

A question was asked, if the Mayor should appoint a separate ad hoc committee of the three members to represent the Central City to spend more in depth time answering the questions of where do we go from here. But the Committee members said no, just do it without a special committee.

Committee member Yee felt that meetings should be held out in the Committee member's districts and direct staff to put all of these reports together and have them all prepared for them so the Committee members can read through them and identify the things in the report that need to be accomplished. Then recommendations can be made from there after Public testimony is given on different meetings.

Committee member Yee stated that there are thirteen reports within the report, and some of them may have been implemented, and it will be up to the staff to give that information. One Committee member knew of three reports of the thirteen that have been implemented: The Alhambra Corridor Study, the General Plan, the Central Housing Strategy.

They established that the three Committee members should meet jointly in the Central City having several meetings reporting back with the results to the joint meeting of the Design Review so that they understand the process specifically. These three members will go out to the neighborhoods and also be asking for testimony and support from the two appointed bodies.

They will also be going to the Neighborhood Committee and the City Council with organizational changes of these issues.

Committee member, Terry Kastanis asked who will work on the plan and track this information.

Professor Jensen said that her group will be doing that and that will be part of the organizational recommendation to the Committee.

Committee member Yee thanked Professor Jensen and her study group for coming before this Committee.

Professor Jensen added that her group is looking at a HUD grant Community Outreach Program to four-year institutions local government community organizations to allow them to provide student research and facility research on issues that identify by local government and local outreach. I will be coming before you to ask for a letter of endorsement.

Committee member Yee said the Council could do a resolution.

An audience member, Mr. Schook, a member of the Board of Old Sacramento Association thanked the members for doing the study, but the funds will come from which budget. While there may be an initial investment, time and money can be saved. That a modem could be used and other cities probably already have this capability if the Committee looked around. Thank you for your efforts.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m..

* * * * *

Chair Jeanne R. Yee

Joyce Wolf Secretary