

**CITY OF SACRAMENTO  
DEVELOPMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION  
SYNOPSIS**

**Monday, August 2, 2004**

Commissioners Present:	Mark Abrahams, Alberto Esquivel, James Gately, Brian Holloway, Daniel Larkin, John Nunan, Johan Otto, Bruce Starkweather
Commissioners Absent:	Michael Malinowski

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1. Call to order and roll call.	Chairman Holloway called the meeting to order at 5:35PM.	
2. Approval of 05/03/04 Synopsis	Chairman Holloway moved to accept the 5/03/04 synopsis as amended (spelling correction). Vote was to approve the 5/03/04 synopsis as amended.	Motion passed. Unanimous
3. Communications a. Comments from the Audience. b. Written Comments Received.	<p>1) Comments from the Audience</p> <p>a) Mike Medema introduced outgoing CBO Dennis Richardson who introduced and reviewed his suggested list of improvements (handouts) and on the state of the Building Division. He stated that his suggestions were meant to be constructive, and that he is proud of staff and DOC accomplishments.</p> <p>b) Tom Armstrong, Developer, commented on lack of proposed park impact fee amendment outreach in his area. He emphasized that they need to get opinion of small developers in infill areas. He shared a few numbers and facts including water development fee in infill development (discounted or waived fees), and tremendous, disproportionate increase for infill fees in proposed increased in proposed park impact fees.</p> <p>2) Written Comments</p> <p>a) No written comments were noted at this time.</p>	Information Only
4. Presentation of Special Recognition	Chairperson Holloway recognized Dennis Richardson for his contributions to the City and the development process. He asked that the audience and the DOC thank Dennis for a job well done, and presented him with a plaque. Bruce Starkweather added his compliments, and committed that the DOC will continue with the implementation of change and improvement in the future. Chairperson Holloway also recognized the Assistant Planning Director, Art Gee, and presented him with a plaque. He complimented his creativity and dedication to the streamlining effort, and added that Art Gee initiated most of the DOC ideas and suggestions adopted by the City Council.	Information Only
5. Proposed Park Impact Fee Amendments	Bob Overstreet presented the proposed park impact fee amendments, reviewing the history of the park impact fee program. Two parks going to City Council this Thursday will be used as a test case to present the insufficient amount of money raised through the current park impact fee program. He presented the rationale for the amendments and the nexus studies used for them. Janet Baker, Park Development Mgr., then outlined the benefits of the park impact fee, and reviewed the use of the fee, stating that they would be going to the City Council for approval at the end of August. She added that the current fee structure is based on a tiered fee structure, and that many jurisdictions are facing the same type of fee concerns that we are. Janet introduced	Review and Comment

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	<p>Tim Yoman who presented a short PowerPoint slide show. Questions from Commissioners included the inclusion of land cost (consultant to return with additional info), relation to infill development and deterioration of existing parks. Infill issues included a modified fee for infill development, request to more closely investigate needs and objectives of infill development. The concern was also presented regarding the percentage of infill projects, and that there will be a dramatic increase in this development within the next few years. The traditional model of classical parks was presented as not pertinent to the increased infill areas. Chairperson Holloway indicated that Lucinda Willcox will cover more of these issues during her presentation (#8).</p>	
<p>6. Benchmark Reporting</p>	<p>Gary Lane, with the Planning Division, presented original intent of benchmark reporting and initial results for the period of 4/1/04 through 6/30/04 reflecting results from Planning, Design Review, Zoning, and Preservation entitlements. He stated that they were preliminary and incomplete (first quarter measured), and that next quarter's results would be more complete. No goal date set reflected applications not yet received by Senior Planners. No comments or questions were noted. Ed Williams, with the Development, Engineering and Finance Division, outlined the tracking system for commercial and residential plan check. He introduced Mary Elms to present the results from the commercial plan check, and that they would return with complete results at the next reporting date. Mary reviewed benchmarks with the DOC, and presented a graph presenting several projects and their outcomes (17 of 31) projects. 14 of those 17 projects fell within benchmark standards. Educational meetings have been initiated with Developers to assist with the completeness and timeliness of project requirements. Staffing will be increased to assist with workload issues, and improve turn-around times. More data will assist with a better analysis. Commissioners' questions and comments included inquiring about the use of this tracking as a helpful tool for staff. Mary responded that the automated features of this system increase efficiencies in project management. Additional questions included more details about re-education efforts, including a series of workshops to demonstrate what a "complete" submittal and a model for an ideally submitted application and set of plans. Ron Fong, with Development, Engineering and Finance, stated that outside developers are somewhat unfamiliar with standards and existing processes that would cause additional cycles of review. Commissioners indicated that this is an issue that we need to address, and that we need to continually question our processes to simplify and meet the needs of the community. It was also observed that City standards do not meet all situations. Variances to address infill areas are also being addressed by DE&amp;F. Dennis Richardson from the Building Division, presented commercial project exceptions in graphical and spreadsheet format. He stated that the biggest exception was in the fire review area. The two other major areas showing exceptions were building &amp; life safety, and public works (Development, Engineering and Finance). Field inspection area is also measured (no report presented). Dennis stated that new triage process would focus on areas that are the most behind.</p>	<p>Review and Comment</p>

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
	He added that contracting issues affected the fire plan check area.	
7. Environmental Streamlining Initiatives	Lezley Buford, from Planning Environmental Services, briefly reviewed the functions of her work group. She also outlined recommended revisions to procedures for implementing CEQA (California Environmental Quality Act) include the protocols and procedures for preparation of documents (by consultants), and the early application for environmental review. Questions from the commission included asking about any opposition to changes (this was the first presentation to public), workload for negative declarations vs. EIRs. No questions or comments were noted from the audience.	Review and Comment
8. Infill Update	Lucinda Willcox, Infill Coordinator, reviewed infill activity in Sacramento. She also reviewed anticipated upcoming projects, including the rail yards, and challenges involving infrastructure, increased construction costs, and getting higher density attached housing projects. In March 2004, Council adopted infill work program, including short-term improvements outlined in agenda packets. Progress on these improvements was also contained in meeting materials. Key policy issues needing address include limited infill resources, limited public assistance, and challenge of balancing increased fees with disincentive to infill. Her department is working with Parks regarding larger policy issue. Questions included possible proposal to decrease proposed parks fees. Lucinda indicated that there is no specific proposal, but there is an infill reduction fund. Fund may have to be increased, or find some other way to reduce fees to maintain same level of fees to encourage small infill projects. Chairperson Holloway asked about Regional San. model that demonstrated real financial incentive for infill. Lucinda stated that she would continue to work with the Parks Dept. on this. Chairperson Holloway asked about a more urban zoning code. Lucinda stated that General Plan update may include a smart code to address this direction.	Review and Comment
9. Proposed Fee and Charge Amendments	Greg Schulte, from the Administrative Division of Development Services, presented an update on proposed fee amendments for the Planning Division of Development Services. He reviewed the history behind the budget reductions and revenue enhancements, including fee revisions. Proposed fee revisions include greater recovery and new fee for General Plan cost recovery. More details were presented in the agenda packet. Costs were investigated vs. actual fees and activity levels, including the subsidy level for each activity. Expected revisions would yield approximately \$410K, and comparison information was included. He also stated that a recommended 4% technology surcharge would be recommended to Council, which would result in approximately \$108K. Comments and questions from the Commission included concerns about value in dollars charged. No questions or comments were noted from the audience.	Review and Comment

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
10. Senior Development Services Department Position Recruitment Updates	Mike Medema from the Development Services Dept, reviewed an update on recruitment updates for key senior positions, including Asst. City Manager/Development Services Director. This recruitment is proceeding very smoothly, and should result in an appointment in or about Dec/Jan. Other recruitments include Senior Engineer for Development Engineering and Finance, Chief Building Official and Media Communications Specialist. All recruitment efforts, with the exception of the Media position will be tracked to coincide with the appointment of the new Director. The new Director will make the final recommendation on the senior positions. An interim appointment will be made for the Chief Building Official will be made shortly.	Information Only
11. Update on Streamlining Workshops	Chairperson Holloway reviewed progress to date on the Early Notification initiatives, including committee meetings and public meetings to generate ideas and provide input. He stated that three tiered review or vetting process would be used for review of concrete ideas, rather than strictly brainstorming for future initiatives including Design Review streamlining, best practices, triage, ombudsman and peer review, etc. Initiatives will then be developed into ordinances as necessary, and brought forward to Council for approval. Commissioner Starkweather reviewed current community involvement with primary focus on preservation issues. He added that we have learned from initial sessions, and that our approach would be adjusted accordingly. Chairperson Holloway added that applicant community had not yet participated, and encouraged DOC members to invite this community to attend and participate.	Information Only
12. Development Services Workload Update	Art Gee from the Development Services Department reviewed quarterly/annual workload statistics. He noted that the growth trend has continued, and that this type of workload would affect the ability to consistently meet benchmark standards. Dennis Richardson, Chief Building Official, remarked that an increase in smaller projects was observed as opposed to larger commercial projects. He does, however, anticipate more large commercial projects with the build out of residential projects in the Natomas area. These projects are more labor intensive. Art Gee that more mixed use and higher density projects were noted, and that activity had not slowed. Commissioner Abrahams asked to speak with staff directly regarding a survey following building permit issuance.	Information Only
13. Communications a. Comments from the Audience.	1) No further comments were noted.	Information only
14. Miscellaneous Reports	Chairperson Holloway discussed a request from Commissioner Malinowski regarding a seminar from the AIA at SMUD on October 2. He asked the DOC to cosponsor the seminar. C Abrahams moved C St seconded. Unanimously adopted.  Art Gee asked that the Commission as requested reviewed items 7 and 9.	Information only
15. Adjournment	Chairman Holloway moved for the adjournment of the meeting at 8 PM.	Motion passed. Unanimous

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
--------------------	-------------------	---------------