Jen D

Original document received from Jen Dart, August 1, 2023
Assumed to include expenditures through the end of June, 2023

City of Arcata Long Range Planning Cost Track - June 2023

Project Tasks	Budget Amount	Budget %	Planwest Partners				Sub-Consultants		June 2023 Total	Total to Date	Remaining	% Remaining
			GW	VB/JM	JB							
			$125	$125	$92	Sub-Total	GHD	B. Noble				
Task 1 - Project Management	$25,013	3%		1.50		$187.50			$187.50	$21,882.50	$3,131	13%
Task 2 - Data Collection/ Analysis - Outreach	$43,975	6%				$0.00			$0.00	$42,030.75	$1,944	4%
Task 3 - General Plan (including additional Circ. Intersections Amend. 5)	$144,423	19%			4.25	$391.00			$391.00	$134,767.25	$9,656	7%
Task 4 - Gateway Area Plan (including Remix Amend.)	$118,835	16%				$0.00			$0.00	$118,220.50	$615	1%
Task 4 - Gateway Area - FBC Outreach & Design	$35,720	5%				$0.00			$0.00	$27,954.90	$7,765	22%
Task 4 - Enhanced FBC (Amend. No. 4)	$114,500	15%		3.75		$468.75		$5,032.50	$5,501.25	$62,218.75	$52,281	46%
Task 5 - CEQA	$222,320	29%				$0.00	$1,084.75		$1,084.75	$177,151.15	$45,169	20%
Task 5 - VMT (Amend. No. 3)	$25,000	3%				$0.00			$0.00	$24,856.25	$144	1%
Task 6 - 3D GIS	$34,596	5%				$0.00			$0.00	$34,408.50	$188	1%
Total Hours			0.00	5.25	4.25							
Total Cost	$764,382	100%	$0.00	$656.25	$391.00	$1,047.25	$1,084.75	$5,032.50	**$7,164.50**	$643,490.55	$120,891	16%

Note: For Amend. No 4 split Planwest $7000 evenly between task 1 & 4

The budget for 3D GIS is 99% spent.

Does not include the cost of the Urban Field Studio Test Site
Feasibility Study, report and presentation. Estimated cost of expenditures ~$40,000
Current balance is ~$53,00 for that Study, and the remainder of Form-Based Code work.

August 16, 2023

Task 5 CEQA - assumed to be EIR work. Balance in June ~$45,000.
We have not yet seen any EIR work, or any of the studies required with the EIR.

Fred Weis
Arcata1.com

Mads Odom

From: Fred [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2023 1:12 PM
To: Sarah Schaefer; Meredith Matthews; Kimberley White; Scott Davies; Dan Tangney; Judith Mayer; Matthew Simmons; Peter Lehman; Joel Yodowitz; Abigail Strickland; Karen Diemer; David Loya; Delo Freitas
Subject: August 22 Agenda Packet -- Change in wording requested

To:
Honorable Mayor Schaefer, Vice-Mayor Matthews, Councilmember White
Chair Davies, Vice-Chair Tangney, Commissioners Mayer, Simmons, Lehman, Yodowitz, and Strickland
City Manager Diemer, Community Development Director Loya, Senior Planner Freitas

Honorable Mayor, and all --

I referred to this issue at last night's City Council meeting. It is a small item, but significant and is consequential. Plus, it's just incorrect.
Also, two links on the Agenda packet needing correction, see below.

Thank you.

-- Fred Weis

Original wording. This is incorrect. The Planning Commission has specifically **NOT** "provided a recommendation to the Council for **adoption**."

"The Planning Commission completed its initial review of the Gateway Area Plan and the Gateway Code on July 11, 2023, **and provided a recommendation to the Council for adoption**."

Suggested change:

"The Planning Commission has provided their July 11, 2023, working draft of the Gateway Area Plan and the Gateway Code to the City Council for discussion and the Council's and the Commission's further consideration."

The City Council is meeting with the Planning Commission on Tuesday, August 22, for the first of three scheduled joint meetings.
The Agenda Packet for the meeting has this. Highlighting added.

"The Planning Commission completed its initial review of the Gateway Area Plan and the Gateway Code on July 11, 2023, **and provided a recommendation to the Council for adoption**." (In two places)

Does this make a difference? Yes, it does.

What the Council has been given is the **Planning Commission's working draft of the General Plan updates**, for discussion and the Planning Commission's own and their further consideration.

The Planning Commission's minutes: The error was fixed

What has been provided to the City Council and is on the record is not what the Planning Commission is recommending for adoption. It just isn't. To say otherwise is not factual.

For some background, at the July 25, 2023, Planning Commission a similar issue came up. In the minutes for the previous meeting, from July 11, the minutes read:

"On a motion by Commissioner Yodowitz, and a second by Vice-chair Tangney, **the Commission adopted the General Plan updates**."

The vote at the July 11 meeting was not about adopting the General Plan. The documents at play at the July 11 meeting were not there to be adopted.

This error was pointed out and discussed at the July 25 Planning Commission meeting, and the minutes were changed. The actual motion for this change was that the minutes should reflect that the Commission "forwarded **a working draft of the General Plan updates** to the City Council for discussion and ours and their further consideration."

Community Development Director David Loya said, "That's a good clarification" and "I think that's a really good change that should be made."

[When the motion was put into the revised minutes, the wording was changed slightly — which unfortunately is all too often the case. The inaccurate version says " to the City Council for discussion and consideration" implying that it is for the Council's discussion and consideration. **The actual wording was "to the City Council for discussion and ours and their further consideration"** — both bodies will be discussing and considering this working draft.]

And the similar error in the joint study session Staff Report

As we can see, the person or people responsible for the Planning Commission's meeting minutes made an error. The Community Development Director made a very similar error in his Staff Report for the joint study session agenda.

To repeat: The City Council has specifically **NOT** been provided a recommendation **for adoption**. Not one little bit.

This small but significant error can be changed

Original wording. Incorrect.

"The Planning Commission completed its initial review of the Gateway Area Plan and the Gateway Code on July 11, 2023, **and provided a recommendation to the Council for adoption**."

Suggested change:

"The Planning Commission has provided their July 11, 2023, working draft of the Gateway Area Plan and the Gateway Code to the City Council for discussion and the Council's and the Commission's further consideration."

The revised agenda can be labeled with the date of the edit and "Version 2" in a location at the top third of the first page, and re-posted to the City's website.

While this is done, two small changes can be made.

1. Page 4 of the packet has "COMMITTEE/COMMISSION REVIEW"
   The link that is attached to "Transportation Safety Committee Recommendation" goes to the Economic Development Committee's page.
   I believe the correct link is: https://www.cityofarcata.org/DocumentCenter/View/12825/2022-08-02-TSC-Adopted

   This is an unfortunate coincidence, as the the recommendations of the Transportation Safety Committee have an extended history of not being reported correctly. (In one case, the TSC was said to be FOR the K-L couplet — and not AGAINST it — and other cases.)

2. The current version of the 7/11/2023 draft Gateway Area Plan is V12a.**2**
   The link for the Track Changes version of the plan goes to V12a.**1**
   V12a.**2** is the more recent version, and has a white box on the cover with a clarifying sentence of text.