1. Introductions

2. Project Background and Information
   a. April 2016: Orchard Park Project Advisory Committee (PAC) formed in
   b. May 2016: Kick Off Meeting
   c. June 2016: Walking tour and amenitize game
   d. September 2016: PAC meeting
   e. October 2016: feasibility analysis
   f. Tonight: an effort to collect more graduate student feedback
   g. Additional information is posted on the Graduate Studies website
      at: https://gradstudies.ucdavis.edu/news/orchard-park-redevelopment-status-report

3. Highlights from June 2016 Walking Tour
   a. Low rise buildings are nice, but students are okay with taller buildings if that
      will preserve open spaces; variation in building heights is welcome
   b. Building appearance is not important; uniformity of building appearance is
      okay; maybe offset the “institutional look” through strategic building
      placement and landscaping
   c. Students prefer clear delineation between what is private and what is shared
      space
      • Private patios should be defined
      • Storage should not be visible
      • Did not like the idea of a shared space for a sub-population like one
      yard for six units because seemed like an artificial attempt to create
      community
      • Community center is a must-have
      • A playroom is a favored amenity
      • Don’t need fixed BBQs, but want space to cook outside
   d. Offer building features that “fit” with our weather
      • Roof overhangs and shades keep buildings cooler in warmer weather
      • Patios should face east/west so that everyone gets some shade/sun
      throughout the day
   e. Love trees and shade
      • Reduce asphalt
      • Okay with parking around the perimeter, even if it means walking
      further to get to unit. This is not as important as preserving open and
      safe kid areas that are separate from cars.
      • Preserve the big trees
f. Like the arrangement of buildings in Solano Park
   • There is a diversity of openings and spaces
   • Don't like the sand boxes; would rather have shaded play areas

4. Discussion Points from Amenitize Game
   a. Strongest preferences
      • Flooring other than carpet
      • Laundry in the unit: especially important for parents with special needs kids; doesn’t seem to raise the marginal cost by much
      • Soundproofing: prevent noises from the bathroom being heard in other rooms of the unit, and so residents in differing units don’t hear noise from neighbors
      • Be clear as to what utilities are included in the monthly cost and what is not. There was a strong preference by some to have internet service be from the campus and included in the monthly cost so there would be access to library and research resources from home (seamless service between central campus to housing).

   b. Other preferences
      • Upgraded kitchen
      • Additional storage: Solano Park offers a good amount; doesn’t have to be more than that
      • Laundry in unit
      • Sustainability: LEED platinum is seen as a “minimum” given the sustainability culture and reputation of the campus. Discussion about this topic included: community garden, rooms with ceiling lights so that residents don’t have to buy/plug in lamps to illuminate a room, and using the weather to our advantage by orienting units for sunlight and having two windows in the units so that a breeze could pass through (less reliance on heaters and air conditioners).
      • Variety of unit sizes: possibly include a few studios and 3-bedroom units in addition to 1- and 2-bedroom units.

   c. Debated preferences
      • Outdoor social space: group wasn’t sure what a social space for non-families would look like. Maybe that population would like an outdoor space that is not a playground. Another suggestion was to have exercise stations around the playground to form a workout circuit.
• If an amenity is offered on campus (e.g., gym, study lounges), it doesn’t need to be replicated within the housing complex.
• Pet-friendly: Concern that if there is a “no pets” policy, residents will claim the animal as disability assistance and there will be a number of animals anyway. Current issues at Solano Park include cat and dog hair in the laundry machines, and aggressive animals that can jump patio fences. One solution is to have a building or section of the complex that is pet-friendly, but away from child play areas. While exact policy preference was unclear, there seems to be consensus that this is an area of concern and there is a need for clarification.
• Dishwasher: split between the conveniences of having a dishwasher versus having the storage space in place of a dishwasher. Brief discussion as having dishwashers as an optional upgrade available in some units but not others.
• Bathtubs: was unclear if the assumption is that all units will have tubs; could be important for family with small children. (This was discussed at a table, not with the whole group.)
• Parking: there was some interest in car sharing, but most people were concerned as to how they would get car seats for children in and out of the vehicles. Many participants favored one assigned parking place for each unit with an additional, optional fee for a second space. Open to having a secondary parking space in a location further away from the housing complex, as well as tandem parking (for the unit). Significant enthusiasm for receiving a rebate (e.g., free annual bus pass) if the residents didn’t have a car.