

City of Rocklin Land Use And Regional Housing Needs Allocation Ad Hoc Committee

Committee Member and City Staff Assessment

Prepared by: Sacramento State University- Consensus and Collaboration Program



CONSENSUS & COLLABORATION PROGRAM (CCP)

College of
Continuing Education



- Neutral, not-for-profit unit of California State University, Sacramento
- Formed in 1992
- **Mission:** Build the capacity of public agencies, stakeholder groups, and the public to use collaborative strategies to improve policy outcomes.

Committee Assessment

- Conducted 10 in-person / phone interviews including:
 - Michael Barron, City Planning Commissioner
 - Peter Bridges - Housing Developer
 - Ken Broadway - City Mayor (2018)
 - Deana Ellis - Housing Developer
 - Peter Hill - Former City Mayor
 - Greg Janda - City Council Member
 - Gregg McKenzie - City Planning Commissioner
 - Jeff Short - North State BIA
 - Ardie Zahedan - Afford Housing Developer
 - City Staff - Marc Mondell, Steve Rudolph, Laura Webster, Michael Young

Committee Assessment

- Presented 4 City Goals for Committee Work
- Used Standard set of questions
 - Are these sufficient goals to address what the City is trying to achieve? If not, what do you recommend should be changed in these expressed goals?
 - Do you have any personal goals / interests for what the Committee should achieve, different from the City's goals?
 - Do you have any concerns with the City's expressed goals and Committee tasks? Are there any potential challenges associated with the Committee's work? If so, what are they and what should the Committee and staff do to be prepared for these challenges?
 - Are there any efforts that have worked and / or not worked in the City's past steps to address the topics focused on by the Committee?

Committee Assessment

- Related to Question 5, what are your perspectives about the City's history and decision-making process on these topics?
- Are there effective examples from elsewhere in the State that Rocklin can pattern solutions from?
- Do you and/or the Committee need background information / educational presentations on anything to help inform the Committee's work?
- Do you have any input on the sequence of topics the Committee should address? Are some of the goals easier than others to address? Should the Committee address easier or more challenging topics first?
- The City (and its Council representatives to the Committee) have expressed a desire for this process to not have a Chairperson or similar structure and to instead look to the facilitator to manage the flow of discussions and process planning. Do you support that approach or would you rather see a different structure?

Committee Assessment Outcomes

- **Sufficiency of Goals**
 - Generally sufficient
 - However: Key concern from several Members that the goals do not address:
 - Vision of City growth
 - Vision of City as a place
 - Fees and cost structures and associated impacts to getting things built
 - Not advocating this now, but recognize it as a shortcoming

Committee Assessment Outcomes

- **Personal Goals and Interests**
 - Consistent passion for / dedication to the City by Members
 - City has transitioned from land use decisions that are structured and methodical, to rapid, entrepreneurial and opportunistic
 - Create a cohesive and consistent approach

Committee Assessment Outcomes

- **Concerns / Challenges**
 - Public Process – “Double edged sword”. Essential to maintain transparency. Difficult to be candid and get some work done
 - Need to use process to educate Council and Community
 - Demystify land use planning
 - Destigmatize affordable housing

Committee Assessment Outcomes

- **Concerns / Challenges (cont.)**
 - Vision of Community is “conceptually” consistent with Members....Preferred methods to achieve it are not
 - Different perspectives about best interests for the City:
 - Densify / Don't densify
 - Historic growth patterns and influences / New paradigms
 - Accommodate developer requests / Don't accommodate requests
 - City effort is fear-based / City effort is timely and needed

Committee Assessment Outcomes

- **Past Successful Efforts**

- Not many examples
- Recent “K-Mart” site by St. Anton most quoted as a success / likely success

Committee Assessment Outcomes

- **City History**

- City has transitioned from land use decisions that are structured and methodical, to rapid, entrepreneurial and opportunistic
- Recent “K-Mart” site by St. Anton most quoted as a success / likely success
- Different role for Council due to different City Manager styles. Need consistency going forward

Committee Assessment Outcomes

- **Effective Examples**

- Few mentioned
- Key variables sought to compare to – “Goldilocks” Effect
 - Similar size and jurisdictional limitations
 - Similar demographics (socially, economically)
 - Similar location (foothills type community / topography)

Committee Assessment Outcomes

- **Background Information Needs / Educational Presentations**
 - Information from affordable housing developers. What works / doesn't work?
 - Understanding what the requirements are for RHNA. Minimum legal obligation? What do we need to achieve?
 - What is our available inventory?

Committee Assessment Outcomes

- **Background Information Needs / Educational Presentations**
 - What are the target numbers we're trying to accomplish? Are these negotiable?
 - What other communities have done to solve these questions?
 - What are the top three outputs that Council and Staff really need to make their life easier?

Committee Assessment Outcomes

- **Background Information Needs / Educational Presentations**
 - Understand the demographic data in the context of Rocklin and Western Placer County. What is Rocklin's place? What are the metrics used by / with SACOG?
 - Understanding / discussion of the employment, industry, housing and transportation paradigm shifts that are happening.

Committee Assessment Outcomes

- **Background Information Needs / Educational Presentations**
 - Presentation on best practices for Mixed Use and National, State, and Regional projections for changes in Mixed Use zoning?

Committee Assessment Outcomes

- **Process Schedule**

- Split Opinion:
 - Do hard items first
 - Do easier items first
 - Uncertainty about what is “easy” and “hard”

CONCLUSION

THANK YOU

Dave Ceppos
Managing Senior Mediator
dceppos@csus.edu
916-539-0350