

**CITY OF SACRAMENTO  
DEVELOPMENT OVERSIGHT COMMISSION  
SYNOPSIS**

**Thursday, February 3, 2005**

Commissioners Present	Bruce Starkweather, John Nunan, Jim Gately, Johan Otto, Michael Malinowski, Mark Abrahams, Brian Holloway, Daniel Larkin
Commissioners Absent	N/A

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION
1. Call to order and roll call	Meeting was called to order at 5:35PM.	
2. Approval of 1/03/05synopsis	Synopsis was approved, with a spelling correction, as submitted.	
3. Communications a. Comments from the Audience b. Written Comments Received.	a. Bruce Holmes spoke regarding the 2005 DOC meeting calendar, and asked about early notification and transparency. He also spoke about the Central City parking study, and zoning code development standard changes. He asked to table all ordinance changes related to parking pending the completion of the study. He expressed concerns regarding the Development Services website. Matthew Piner read a statement and distributed copies of the statement in addition to a list of signatures regarding support for DRPB participation in the DOC streamlining process. Dale Kooyman spoke regarding a memo outlining a crisis in 15-backlogged design review applications, and concerns regarding staffing. Steven Ballew spoke asking for clarification regarding personnel reviewing Design Review applications. He also asked for a definition of peer review. He also added comments regarding design guidelines, and the need for DOC involvement in the formation of those design guidelines. He asked for comments regarding the streamlining blueprint created in 2004. He asked about further steering committee participation. Christina McBurney spoke regarding the need for a current Design Review member to serve on the Design Review subcommittee. Loree Stetson commented regarding the need for community involvement in subcommittees. She added that everyone wanted a better product, and that should be the ultimate goal. Darin Gale from the Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce spoke regarding proposed amendments to	Information only.

**AGENDA ITEM****DISCUSSION****ACTION**

	<p>the Fee and Charge Report for Development Engineering and Finance. He asked the Commission to encourage staff to demonstrate increased efficiencies and certainties in return for requests for increased fees. The Chamber representative cited consistency, clarity and certainty as key goals. Mel Billingsley commented that fees for early review and notification would discourage that process. Steven Ballew commented on the Early Notification Pilot program. Christina McBurney commented on the need to focus on quality development and the resources available in Sacramento to encourage this. Steven Ballew commented on the presence of the Design Review and Preservation Board members. Roxanne Miller commented on the establishment of the Broadway Corridor Task Force and the need for quality development.</p> <p>b. No written comments were noted.</p>	
--	--	--

**AGENDA ITEM****DISCUSSION****ACTION**

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>
4. Amendment to Fee and Charge Report for Development Engineering and Finance	<p>Mary Elms presented a recommendation to move forward an amendment to the Fee and Charge report for Development Engineering and Finance. She outlined the process of assessing the fees and costs. She added that an outreach letter was circulated to several organizations and customers, in addition to follow up phone calls. Input from various stakeholders included the need for improved and enhanced services in return for increased fees. She added explanation in the structure of current fees and the addition of three new fees, including a technology fee, a substantial conformance for final parcel and master parcel maps, and a validation of fee credits. Revised fees include minor permits (driveway, encroachment, excavation, certificates of compliance, publications) and final map and parcel map (changed from fixed fee to total cost recovery). Actual deposits were also reviewed, and recommended to be increased, with the need to minimize invoicing by the City. Input from stakeholders (letters) was distributed by Staff. Commissioner Nunan stated that a key aspect of full cost recovery fees with a deposit was certainty in fees. He added that from an applicant standpoint, the need for the lack of surprises was very important. He stressed the need for data regarding total cost recovery. Commissioner Malinowski stated that he was opposed to total cost recovery model in City fees. He cited the example in the automotive repair business of using industry standards rather than at total cost recovery model. He added that the notion of certainty was contrary to the idea of total cost recovery. Commissioner Otto added an example of the lack of certainty regarding fees, and the lack of knowledge regarding how the fees were calculated relating to a specific project that he was working on in the City. Mary Elms explained the project accounting process that is currently in place to track hours and costs relating to each project. Commissioner Holloway added comments regarding a large bill that arrives at the end of the projects and asked about validation of fee credit reimbursement. Ed Williams explained the validation process. He added explanations regarding deposits. Commissioner Holloway asked where</p>	Review and comment

**AGENDA ITEM****DISCUSSION****ACTION**

	<p>applicants could find the fee information. Mary Elms answered that the fees would be posted on the Development Services website, and any changes to fee schedules would be reflected on the website. Commissioner Holloway suggested that the Department publish average fees, for reference by the applicant community. He added that a recommendation for a credit for infill projects should be added. Commissioner Starkweather added that he agreed with Commissioner Malinowski's concerns regarding total cost recovery. He asked when the City would look at the big picture of where the fees would be generated. He asked about incentives for saving time, and an equitable distribution of where the costs were shared throughout the system, and that he would like to see a better view of how many fee amendments were coming forward, and that they should not be submitted one at a time. Commissioner Starkweather asked about the next steps in the Amendment request, and how the comments would be reflected in the progress of the request. Mary Elms stated that they would review the comments and concerns with Ray Kerridge, the new Director, to determine next steps.</p>	
<p>5. Report from ACM/Director</p>	<p>Ray Kerridge reviewed staffing augmentation requests in the midyear budget, work on the 04/05 budgets, and work on the Department Management Plan. He has asked staff to prepare a 5-year financial plan, including a five-year fee analysis, which would be presented to the DOC. He added that a fee policy discussion would take place with the City Council. He stated that the next Team building workshops, would take place next week, including several DOC members. He announced the permanent appointments of Ed Williams and Ron Beehler. He commented on Staff assistance on DOC initiatives, including the mapping of current processes, and the review of the feasibility of opening permit centers earlier in the day, including a homeowners night (one night a week) to make the Department more accessible to the public. He added that Gary Stonehouse would review a regulatory review process. Finally, he stated that the Help Desk functions were under review for possible changes. Commissioner Abrahams expressed his</p>	<p>Information only</p>

**AGENDA ITEM****DISCUSSION****ACTION**

	<p>pleasure in the new emphasis on homeowners, and volunteered to assist where needed. Commissioner Otto stated that he supported the review of current processes. Commissioner Starkweather stated that he had met with Ray Kerridge, and that they had discussed the evolving role of the Commission in working with the Department. He welcomed Ray's vision, and a work plan with mutual activities to improve the system where needed the most. Ray Kerridge stated that he would have a draft report for review by the DOC prior to the next meeting. Gary Stonehouse outlined three steps in the regulatory review process, and explained the program of regulatory review, and cited examples of inconsistent, incomplete and outdated ordinances, and the need for consolidations in many ordinances. He stated that an assigned staff member would head this effort of regulatory review and revision, and that a campaign would be launched for this program. Ray Kerridge added that this program would center on non-policy issues, and that it could be controversial due to interpretation issues. Commissioner Holloway asked if the City had a zoning code interpretation committee, and that other jurisdictions used their Planning Commission as a zoning interpretation board for larger issues. Gary Stonehouse stated that the Zoning Administrator was the interpreter of ordinances, and that a policy group met on occasion to review zoning interpretation. Ray Kerridge asked for guidance regarding a report back. Commissioner Starkweather stated that this tied into the broader issue of an ongoing assessment, looking ahead with continual process improvements, and said that the report back would be appropriate in 60 days. Commissioner Holloway added that this would be an opportunity for good PR. Commissioner Otto added comments regarding common sense in interpretation.</p>	
<p>6. Updates on Development Services Initiatives</p>	<p>Gary Stonehouse reported regarding 32 proposed planning ordinance changes, and community outreach associated with those proposed changes. He stated that the parking measures would be coordinated with the transportation dept., and that these changes were Phase I in streamlining measures. Phase II would reduce the number of hearing items to</p>	<p>Information only</p>

**AGENDA ITEM**

**DISCUSSION**

**ACTION**

	<p>the Planning Commission by 50%. Commissioner Starkweather asked about timing, and Gary Stonehouse answered that he anticipated that we would be in the hearing process in April 2005, and a report back to the DOC would precede that. Kimberlee Alling reported on an IT overview and upgrading plans. She outlined improvements, including wireless technology, PC replacement, and new, improved versions of software that would be web-based, and would enable applicants to review their permit status on-line. She outlined the additional equipment needs necessary to accomplish the upgrades. She anticipates that the City should be wireless and GIS integrated by Fall 2005. She also reviewed the due diligence efforts, including site visits, and the costs and cost savings associated with IT upgrades. Kimberlee also identified the need to upgrade the IVR (interactive voice response) system, and the need for document imaging (scanning) of permits and associated documents. Commissioner Malinowski asked about the replacement schedule of 4 years. Commissioner Holloway asked about the type of equipment (PCs) that is planned. Gary Stonehouse added that Staff who spent time in community outreach meetings would require laptops. Commissioner Abrahams asked about training time required for Inspectors. Ray Kerridge clarified that the web accessibility of permit status would include a status update of plan review. Art Gee briefed the Commission regarding the Design Review Manager selection. He stated the interviews would be on 2/18/05, and would include 7 candidates. He reviewed the composition of the interview panel, including representatives from the DOC, DRPB, CPC, AIA and community members. He added that the Director would interview the top candidates, and final selection/appointment would be made by the City Manager. Art Gee also updated the Commission on the Team building workshops, on 2/11, 12 and 14, 2005. He reviewed an outline of the agenda, and stated that 1/3 of the Department staff would attend the workshop each day. Bruce Starkweather asked for date commitments from the Commissioners. Commissioner Abrahams will attend on the 11<sup>th</sup>,</p>	
--	--	--

**AGENDA ITEM****DISCUSSION****ACTION**

	<p>Commissioner Holloway will be there on the 10<sup>th</sup>, Commissioner Starkweather on the 14<sup>th</sup>, Commissioner Gately and Commissioner Otto will call with availability. Commissioner Holloway solicited DOC members to appear at Council on Tuesday, 2/8/05 at 2pm to support the Teambuilding supplemental contract. Beth Tincher reported regarding focus groups and stated that one planning session has been held to date. She stated that the first focus group session, with complex project customers, would be held in mid-March, utilizing Mason-Smith Success Strategies as facilitator, and the final outcome would include a report of results. She distributed a list of potential participants for the first focus group, for review and comment by the DOC, with the intent of having 15-20 attendees at the meeting. Commissioner Malinowski added that the recommendation was to hold a more scientific study every two years, and that these sessions would focus on relationship building and a partnering connection with the applicants. Commissioner Holloway commented on the addition of more organizations to the invitee list.</p>	
<p>7. Subcommittee Reports</p>	<p>Bob Chase reported regarding the Design Review subcommittee, and progress to date. He stated that the DRPB had a strategic planning session on 2/2/05, and outlined the progress made in Design Review for the City. He added that early review and comment has been implemented, peer review has been implemented on select projects. He stated that the timing of the split of the DRPB needed to be at the time when the strength of the two boards was equal, and that it was not at that point yet. He also stated that upon the completion of a summary of progress made to date by the subcommittee, the chair responsibilities would be transferred to the new DRPB Chair, Chris Elliott. He introduced Chris to the Commission, who spoke regarding his willingness to help in the work of the DOC. Commissioner Malinowski commented on peer review, and stated that peer review was more embracing of the entire community, not just design review. He added that the AIA was standing by, and ready to contribute resources to the peer review process at any time. Art Gee reported on the Early Notification Pilot program, and that the</p>	<p>Review and comment</p>

**AGENDA ITEM****DISCUSSION****ACTION**

	<p>rollout would be on 2/17/05.  Commissioner Holloway asked about next steps and additions to the pilot.  Commissioner Nunan reported on the Best Practices Subcommittee, and stated that two meetings had occurred since the beginning of the year. He added that the subcommittee would work together with City staff to ensure that efforts would be coordinated. He also commented on the New Residential Plan Check program, stating that this best practices initiative was already implemented, and that he was very excited about the improvement.</p>	
8. DOC Discussion of Priorities	<p>Commissioner Starkweather asked fellow Commissioners to outline ideas for priorities. Commissioner Abrahams stated that he would like to see the list of original initiatives move forward. Commissioner Gately agreed with Commissioner Abrahams, and stated that one of the priorities of the Commission should be to support Ray Kerridge and Development Services Staff.  Commissioner Malinowski stated that he was pleased that the Commission was clarifying its focus, and would like to bring back a Common Sense Ordinance. Commissioner Nunan stated that he is gratified by the degree to which Staff has embraced the mission. Commissioner Holloway stated that he saw a change in culture with the Staff at the Team building workshops, and would like to encourage more ideas from Staff to improve the processes. He added a suggestion to have the Media and Communications Specialist report at every DOC meeting regarding outreach and media efforts. Commissioner Otto stated that he agreed on the Common Sense ordinance, and that Staff needed to be empowered to make decisions without retribution. Commissioner Starkweather added that an additional area for work would be additional Departments under the City's umbrella to be a part of the process, and included and involved in the streamlining process. Commissioner Holloway stated that he thought Economic Development Department attendance at DOC meetings would be beneficial, and suggested the invitation should be made by the Chair.</p>	Information only
9. Commendations	<p>Commissioner Starkweather recognized Mike Medema for his stewardship during the past year in his role as Interim Director. He also recognized Commissioner Holloway for his role as</p>	Information only

**AGENDA ITEM****DISCUSSION****ACTION**

	past Chair, complimenting him on community outreach. Commissioner Holloway thanked his fellow Commissioners and Staff.	
10. Miscellaneous Reports		Information only
11. Adjournment	The meeting was adjourned at 8:05PM.	