

**65<sup>th</sup> STREET  
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
Minutes**



**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:04 p.m. by Chairperson J.D. Stack.

**ROLL CALL**

**RAC Members Present:** Robbie Abelon, Mel Billingsley, Chandra Clady, Gary Little, Marcia Maleske, Maggie O'Mara, David O'Toole, Dave Sikich, J.D. Stack, Christopher Wilson

**RAC Members Absent:** Matthew Altier, Fred Arnold, Steven R. Jones, Betty Lopez.

**Staff Present:** Tim Padden, Celia Yniguez

**III. INTRODUCTIONS**

Redevelopment Advisory Committee (RAC) Members introduced themselves and audience members did likewise.

**IV. APPROVAL OF RAC MEETING MINUTES**

The minutes of the November 2, 2006 meeting were unanimously approved pending changes and edits as submitted on a motion made by Mr. Billingsley and seconded by Ms. O'Mara.

**V. REDEVELOPMENT ITEMS**

**A. Park/Detention Basin Presentation**

J.P. Tindell from the City of Sacramento's Parks and Recreation Department was invited to give a presentation on the formal public process that Parks Department must undertake in order plan for the design of a park/detention basin. Ms. Tindell discussed how the park/detention site on Redding Avenue is approximately seven acres. The public process would entail a series of community meetings (usually 2-3 public meetings). The Parks Department would work closely with the Neighborhood Services Department (NSD) to invite key stakeholders in the community to the public meetings. All parks projects must go through the Parks and Recreation Commission. After going to the commission, the project would then proceed forward to the city council. Ms. Tindell explained how the

entire public approval process, including taking the master plan to the City Council, would take approximately six months to complete. Ms. Tindell also brought an illustration of a joint park/detention basin and passed the picture around to the RAC. Ms. Tindell explained that walking paths could be placed around the perimeter of the detention basin, in addition to picnic facilities, that would be passive in nature. RAC member Sikich asked if there were any existing park/detention basins in the area today. Ms. Tindell had a photo of one, but did not know the name of the park/detention basin. She will find out the name before the next RAC Meeting.

RAC Member O'Mara asked what would distinguish a park from a grassy field. Ms. Tindell responded that improvements would be necessary in order for a field to be considered a park. Example of improvements would be irrigation, and landscaping improvements. Furthermore, the park would be maintained on a routine basis. RAC Member O'Toole inquired about possible park amenities. Would there be basketball and tennis courts for instance? O'Toole also inquired about the formal process to make suggestions (e-mail, phone calls, etc...)? Ms. Tindell provided the RAC with her contact information and stated that the RAC can call her at any time if they had comments and/or suggestions on possible park amenities and design ideas. Ms. Tindell explained in detail that the City of Sacramento has a Parks and Recreation Programming Guide for each of the planning areas within the city. RAC member O'Toole inquired if the development fees generated in a redevelopment area would stay there. Ms. Tindell responded by saying that development fees (Quimby Fees for example) would not be confined to a particular redevelopment area, but it would be confined to the planning area which the development fees were generated in.

RAC Member O'Mara stated that community input on Park components are more important than certain individual preferences. O'Mara used the Community Garden in Downtown Sacramento as an example of this. Knowing who the audience will help determine the necessary amenities for the park O'Mara added. Ms. Tindell agreed, and believes that a good community outreach effort in the area is important. RAC Member Wilson inquired if Portal Park is a detention basin. Ms. Celia Yniguez from the Sacramento Housing & Redevelopment Agency (SHRA) believes that Portal Park is in part a detention basin.

RAC Member O'Mara suggested that the Parks Department explore the possibility of covering the detention basin with a cement roof and placing a park on top of the detention basin. Permanent fixture could then be placed on top of the covering. Ms. Yniguez stated that she worked on the team that explored bridging I-5 in Sacramento. Ms. Yniguez explained that these sorts of structures are extremely costly. RAC Member O'Mara would like to see the financial data associated with creating cement covered park. RAC Chairperson Stack brought up issues pertaining to security. If there is a park, there should be security to prevent crime. Ms. Yniguez stated that is why SHRA is looking at the Cookson Properties, to provide greater visibility for the park. RAC Member O'Mara encouraged the Parks Department to develop components that would allow a park to be used throughout the day (Tahoe Park is a good example). One way to enhance the security aspects of the park is to bring in more law-abiding citizens for

several hours during the day.

### **B. Review and Recommendation of Elvas Avenue Streetscape Improvement Project**

Mr. Tim Padden from SHRA presented to the RAC an overview of the Elvas Avenue Streetscape Improvement Project. Mr. Padden explained to the RAC that Phase I of the Elvas Avenue Streetscape Improvement Project would require \$150,000 of 2006 Tax Exempt Bond funds. Elvas Avenue serves as a primary connector between 65<sup>th</sup> Street and J Street in the 65<sup>th</sup> Street Redevelopment Project Area. On the east side of Elvas Avenue between J Street and 62<sup>nd</sup> Street the sidewalks are rolled-curbs which provide less demarcation between the roadway and the sidewalk than vertical curbs. This street has the potential for increased pedestrian traffic due to the high school and college students as well as residents and business customers. The Elvas Avenue Streetscape Improvements Project (Project) would address sidewalk improvements by constructing vertical curb sidewalks. Mr. Padden explained that the Project would have two phases: design and construction. Phase I would include performing topographic surveys, determining existing right-of-way, and providing conceptual plans for improvements, including preliminary cost estimates. Phase 2 would include preparing engineering plans and construction. Design would take approximately six months and construction twelve to eighteen months. There are no City of Sacramento transportation funds readily available to begin planning work on this project.

Mr. Padden went on to explain that the Project is consistent with the 65<sup>th</sup> Street Transit Village Plan and the 65<sup>th</sup> Street Five-Year Implementation Plan. Furthermore, at the November 2, 2006 Redevelopment Advisory Committee Meeting, the 65<sup>th</sup> Street Redevelopment Project Area “Short-list” of potential projects was recommended for approval. Elvas Avenue was listed in the “Short-list” of projects. .

Mr. Padden stated that the Project, when constructed will improve the street by installing more pedestrian-friendly sidewalks. Students, local residents, transit users, and business customers will have a safer and more aesthetically pleasing streetscape. The 65<sup>th</sup> Street Redevelopment Project Area will benefit due to increased pedestrian traffic that will take place as a result of the Project. Upon completion of Phase I, funding sources would be identified to complete construction documents and construction as part of Phase II of the Project. There is currently \$1,550,000 of 2006 65<sup>th</sup> Street Tax Exempt Bond funds available. Phase 1 of the Project will require funds in the amount of \$150,000.

Mr. Padden received numerous comments on the project from the RAC. Several RAC Members were concerned about the bicycle lanes. RAC Member O’Mara asked if there would be bike lanes included as part of the Project. O’Mara also stated that there is a need to install a curb cut at the Elvas Tunnel. RAC member Billingsley stated how rolled curbs have actually helped him as a bicyclist riding along Elvas Avenue. RAC Member Clady wanted to know the total cost of the project, and the number of students from the high school who would use a bike/pedestrian path. RAC Member Sikich asked how pedestrians can get across Elvas Avenue. There is a signal that allows pedestrians to cross on Elvas Avenue. RAC Chairperson Stack was concerned that many high school students from St. Francis High School would not use the pedestrian sidewalk for a couple of

reasons. First, it was on the opposite side of the street, and second many students who attend St. Francis High School live outside the immediate area. Several RAC Members were also concerned about lighting issues along Elvas Avenue. RAC Member O'Mara would like to see a more detailed vision of the sidewalk.

Ms. Yniguez and Mr. Padden reminded the RAC that the item before them tonight was to recommend approval on only Phase 1 of the project (which included an analysis of cost estimates, determining existing right-of-way, and providing conceptual plans for improvements). Phase 1 is the planning and design phase of the project. RAC Member Wilson supported the notion to explore the possibility of determining what is needed in terms of potential streetscape improvements along the east side of Elvas Avenue.

On a motion made by RAC Member Wilson, and seconded by RAC Member Little the RAC approved, on the condition that all comments relating to the inclusion of bike lanes, lighting, and the overall vision of the proposed sidewalk, the Elvas Avenue Streetscape Improvement Project. Two RAC members, RAC Member Clady and O'Toole, opposed the motion.

### **C. Redevelopment Area Update**

SHRA Redevelopment Planner Tim Padden reported on the following:

#### 65<sup>th</sup> Street Transit Village Plan Amendment and Redding Avenue:

Mr. Padden reported to the RAC that the Request for proposals (RFP's) for two projects in the 65<sup>th</sup> Street Redevelopment Area will be released in the next month. The 65<sup>th</sup> Street Transit Village Plan Amendment RFP is scheduled to be released on December 15, while the Redding Avenue Alternative Mode Improvements Project's RFP is scheduled to be released on January 13, 2007.

Design Annex: This application by Design Annex (previously reviewed by the RAC) was approved on October 26<sup>th</sup> by the City Zoning Administrator. A variance was granted to the property owner allowing the business to have seven foot rear setback. Zoning allows for a fifteen rear setback. An adjacent property owner wrote a complaint letter to the Development Services Department stating their disagreement with the Zoning Administrator's approval. However, the Development Services Department felt that the Design Annex's seven foot rear setback was "in line" with the overall community. Therefore, the seven foot rear setback will stand.

Form Based Codes: Mr. Padden presented the RAC with a follow-up to an inquiry about the possibility of including the 65<sup>th</sup> Street Redevelopment Area as a possible pilot area for Round 2 of form-based codes testing. There are three pilot areas within the City of Sacramento. The three pilot areas include Alkali Flat, East Sacramento, and Oak Park. A handful of RAC Members were interested in the possibility of including the 65<sup>th</sup> Street Redevelopment Area as a pilot area for subsequent trial areas. Round 2 would be scheduled for May or June of 2007.

#### Proposition 90:

Mr. Padden simply mentioned to the RAC that Proposition 90 did not pass.

### RAC Term Expirations and RAC Vacancy

Mr. Padden reminded the four RAC Members whose terms expire on January 8<sup>th</sup> to please submit an application to the 65<sup>th</sup> Street RAC. Additionally, Mr. Padden mentioned that eight applications have come in for the vacant seat on the RAC which is a joint District 3 and 6 nominations. The deadline for the vacant position is December 22, 2006.

### Ethics Training:

Mr. Padden reminded those RAC Members who have not completed the Ethics training course is required of all appointed positions to please do so. Mr. Padden stated that the requirement may be met by taking an online course at

<http://www.localethics.fppc.ca.gov>.

## **VII. COMMUNICATION FROM RAC MEMBERS AND PUBLIC ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

Community member Roxanne Fuentes mentioned that on the west side of Elvas Avenue, the lighting is very pronounced. The glow is very bright at night, and people should have no problem seeing the street during the dark hours of the day. RAC Member Clady mentioned to the audience on the subject of Target, that the City of Davis has a preliminary design for what can be considered as an urban Target. Clady also mentioned that she heard the City of Sacramento is in preliminary talks with JPI on the driving range site. RAC Member O'Toole would like to explore the minimum and maximum parking standards that exist, particularly in the transit-overlay zone. RAC Member Clady suggested we evaluate the Rasmussen project once completed to see how successful or unsuccessful the parking standards were for that project. RAC Member Wilson commended developer Mark Lucas for his efforts in the area. RAC Members Abelon and Maleske requested for a horseshoe shape configuration at future RAC Meetings to help alleviate noise issues. The RAC agreed.

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

At approximately 7:40 pm, the meeting adjourned upon unanimous vote on a motion by Mr. Little and seconded by Mr. Sikich.