



**CITY OF DAVIS  
SOCIAL SERVICES COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES**

**Monday, July 21, 2014**

**7:00 pm**

**Community Chambers**

**23 Russell Blvd.**

**Davis, CA 95616**

**Social Services Commission  
Members Present:**

Sarah Mungas, Donald Kalman, R. Matthew Wise,  
Judy Wolf (Chairperson), Jenna Templeton (Vice Chairperson),  
Mindy Romero

**Commissioners Absent:**

Bernita Toney, Amanda Steidlmayer

**Council Liason:**

Robb Davis

**Staff:**

Danielle Foster, Housing and Human Services Superintendent  
Kelly Stachowicz, Deputy City Manager  
Adrienne Heinig, Administrative Aide

**Members of the Public Present:**

Rachel Iskow (Mutual Housing California), Dorte Jenson,  
Maurilio León (Community Housing Opportunities Corporation),  
Angie López (Community Housing Opportunities Corporation),  
Lisa Baker (Yolo County Housing), Chet Dahal, Seeta Sharma,  
Luke Watkins (Neighborhood Partners, LLC),  
Alysa Meyer (Legal Services of Northern CA),  
Darryl Rutherford (Sacramento Housing Alliance), Jan Solorzano

---

**1. Called to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 7:05 p.m. by Chairperson Wolf.

**2. Approval of Agenda:**

Commissioner Templeton moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Commissioner Wise. The motion passed unanimously.

**3. Approval of the Minutes:**

Commissioner Templeton moved to approve the minutes of May 19, 2014, seconded by Commissioner Wise. The motion passed unanimously, with Commissioners Romero and Mungas abstaining.

Commissioner Wise moved to approve the minutes of June 9, 2014, seconded by Commissioner Mungas. The motion passed unanimously, with Commissioner Romero abstaining.

**4. Public Comment:**

None.

**5. Commissioner and Staff Communications:**

Staffmember Foster reminded the commissioners that applications for those commissioners who are terming out are due soon, should they wish to continue their work on the commission. Four commissioners are terming out this year, Judy Wolf, Jenna Templeton, Sarah Mungas and Amanda Steidlmayer.

Staffmember Foster also updated the commission on the recent City Council approval of the Non-Event Fundraiser, the dedication of the city's first universal design playground, held on July 10<sup>th</sup> of this year, and presented the Proclamation from the California State Senate to mark the occasion.

In response to a question from the commission about the Free Lunch program offered by the school district this summer, Angie López, representing Community Housing Opportunities Corporation, which hosted one site at Windmere Apartments in Davis, told the commission roughly 20 to 30 children had been taking advantage of the program each day at her site. She said the opportunity had been a learning experience, and was of the opinion that more advertising for the community sites (those not located at the schools) would increase attendance.

**6. Business Items:**

**A. Affordable Housing Workshop #4- *Conclusions and Recommendations.***

Staffmember Foster gave an introduction to the last in the four-part workshop series on the City's affordable housing program. This final workshop focused on the recommendations generated from the workshop discussions to be presented to City Council in the fall. She also presented the Matrix of Action Areas, a set of recommendations presented from a summary of the previous three workshop discussions. The commission reviewed and amended this matrix as part of their consideration of the action items.

The Commission opened this item for public comment and allowed comment throughout the item. The following comments were provided at various points throughout the discussion, from both members of the public and the commission:

Dorte Jenson outlined her concern about housing priorities being focused on addressing the needs of the homeless in Davis. She felt the stakeholders group created to examine the issue of homelessness did not include voices from the homeless community, or local interested community members. She was also taken aback by the requirements for shelter in Davis having a "strings attached" approach, as opposed to the no strings attached model of the 100khomes.org national organization. In response, Staffmember Foster discussed the County approach to homelessness as being historically treatment first with transitional housing, and then permanent housing. She also clarified that the 100khomes.org model does not provide funding for the homes; local jurisdictions must supply the funding. She reiterated that the

City is a member of the 10 Year Commission to End Homelessness, a county-wide effort, that is going to be holding town halls in Davis and Woodland, as well as other Yolo County locations, to increase involvement and look at revamping the commission. Members of the public are encouraged to attend; information will be available on the website for Yolo County Housing. Lisa Baker, the director of Yolo County Housing discussed plans to develop local vulnerability indexes for each jurisdiction participating in the commission, and said that the commission was starting an outreach process for future directions.

Jan Solorzano encouraged the commission to help very-low income households by thinking small, in terms of housing unit size. In her opinion, the true crisis in housing is felt by single-person households, and 800-1100 sq. ft. homes could address that need.

Commissioner Templeton asked about the possibility of using some of the city's existing, undeveloped land dedication sites as trials for the housing-first model of addressing homelessness. Staffperson Foster responded that the RFP issued to develop the city's sites could include that vision as an option for the property. Commissioner Kalman cautioned that homelessness was not a "cookie-cutter" issue, and a system would need to be in place to connect individuals with the services they need. Staffperson Foster stated that this type of triage approach is currently done by Davis Community Meals.

Lisa Baker spoke on the issue of a multifaceted approach to homelessness, commenting that homelessness is a regional issue which needs to be dealt with regionally. The biggest issue facing the county at present is chronic homelessness in veterans, and there is no VA center in the county. Even with access to a VA with supportive services, assistance can be complicated if the veteran had not received an honorable discharge.

Darryl Rutherford cautioned the commission against creating an atmosphere that criminalized homelessness, as people should not be criminalized for trying to make money through panhandling.

Further discussion on matters relating to homelessness was postponed to a later community discussion being planned by the 10 Year Plan Commission and city staff.

In reviewing the recommendations made in conjunction with the Matrix of Action Areas, Commissioner Kalman asked for clarification on recommendation #3.

3. *The City should develop a standard, adequate in-lieu fee with a defined application of the fee, by right if possible.*

Commissioner Kalman asked to explain "standard", "adequate" and "by right" in the context of this recommendation. Staffperson Foster explained "standard" means a set fee based on average area costs, "adequate" means the fee must be high enough to produce an affordable unit, and "by right" means more developer certainty in the approach.

On this issue, Luke Watkins spoke on the uncertainty of how in-lieu fees are calculated. In his opinion, to produce the housing to meet the most urgent need (supportive housing for those with special needs), the primary focus needs to be on land dedication sites. The availability of in-lieu fees and the Accessory Dwelling Units takes resources away from the Affordable Housing program, and gives them back to the developer.

---

Darryl Rutherford also spoke on in-lieu fees, stating that any type of fee would need to be maximized as much as possible, due to the lack of resources available for affordable housing projects. In his opinion, it should be on the onus of the developer to meet the affordable housing requirements set forth by the city. He also iterated the need for the city and the developer to take into account broader community needs and concerns when the methods of meeting affordable housing requirements are being discussed.

Alysa Meyer reminded the commission that the acceptance of an in-lieu fee transfers the obligation to provide the affordable housing unit/units back to the city.

Maurilio Leon stated that in his opinion the in-lieu fee was necessary, but should be a last resort rather than the rule.

Jan Solorzano also added that in-lieu fees are too inflexible, and they benefit market-rate housing.

After discussion, the commission made the following recommendations:

Summary of Action Area Items from Matrix (Matrix Attached):

*Comments on item #1: Add “properties” after existing affordable housing in the first sentence.*

1. Continue to support the preservation of existing affordable housing **properties** and units as a funding priority of the program and through city support in the completion of necessary affordable housing rehabilitation.

*Comments on item #2: Add “and underutilized sites” after access for other opportunities in the last sentence of the paragraph.*

2. Focus local affordable housing resources (land and funding) on very low and extremely low income housing units, including the development of special needs housing as needed and as outside funding sources allow. Include evaluation of the two land dedication sites through a RFP process to evaluate feasibility of affordable housing development sites and value of land, including alternative use as a market rate development. Assess other opportunities **and underutilized sites** for affordable housing development by redirecting existing resources.

*Comments on item #3: None, other than clarification from Commissioner Kalman.*

3. The City should develop a standard, adequate in-lieu fee with a defined application of the fee, by right if possible.

*Comments on item #4: add “including access to ensure flow of information between the city and local advocacy groups” after affordable housing programs in the first sentence.*

4. Staff and the City Council should actively engage in the development and changes to state and federal affordable housing programs, **including access to ensure the flow of information between the city and local advocacy groups**, with the goal of supporting program requirements that are compatible with local affordable housing development.

*Comments on item #5: Insert “prioritize” before the land dedication option in the second sentence. For the last sentence, add “regarding the use of accessory dwelling units, please see the commission’s recommendations” on the date the topic was discussed.*

5. Consider existing Affordable Housing Ordinance and recent updates from 2013. As part of any updates, **prioritize** the land dedication option as the primary method for fulfilling affordable housing requirements. Examine carefully and **scrutinize** the availability of the in-lieu fee option, and in-lieu fee amount calculation. **Regarding the use of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), please see the Commission’s recommendation from February 2013. The Commission continues to have concerns with the actual and ongoing affordability of second units and their ability to provide fair housing that serves households in need, consistent with their February 2013 5-2 motion against amending the ordinance for this option of second units.**

*Comments on item #6: For the last sentence, reference date of previous Commission action on the Universal Access Policy.*

6. Complete drafting of the Ordinance for the Universal Access Policy, as previously directed in **November 2012.**

Commissioner Mungas moved to approve the action items as amended, and it was seconded by Commissioner Kalman, Commissioner Wise and Commissioner Romero. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **B. Social Services Commission Work Plan 2014.**

Chairperson Wolf made a motion to table discussion of the work plan and move the item to the next commission meeting in September. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Templeton. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **7. Adjournment.**

Commissioner Romero made a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Mungas. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting ended at 9:30 p.m.

Respectively Submitted by,

Danielle Foster  
Housing and Human Services Superintendent

## Matrix of Affordable Housing Workshop Action Areas

### Workshop #1- Historical Look at City of Davis Affordable Housing Program

| Action Area (Subject)  | Current Status   | Information Gathered/<br>Workshop Discussion  | Action Steps (Recommendation)   | Projected Cost   |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| 1) Preservation of Existing Housing  | The city has set aside a little over half a million dollars of affordable housing funding for the preservation of Pacifico, Rosa Parks, Sojourner Truth, Sterling Court, and other aging units.  | Panelists agreed on the need for the preservation of existing affordable housing units, not only through enforcement but also through maintenance of housing quality by rehabilitating units. | Continue to support the preservation of existing affordable housing units as a funding priority of the program and through completion of necessary housing rehabilitation. (Action Item 1)                                  | No additional cost at this time, dependent upon project proposals going forward.   |
| 2) Addressing Needs of Very Low and Extremely Low Income Households          | The city has made progress on these needs in its most recent affordable rental projects (Cannery Lofts, New Harmony, Cesar Chavez Plaza, and Eleanor Roosevelt Circle), as these projects have focused on deeper affordability and some special needs housing. | Panelists discussed the long waitlist length for very low and extremely low income units, not otherwise provided in the housing market.   | Continue to support the development of affordable housing units to serve these groups not otherwise served. Focus local resources (land and funding) on projects with these units. (Action Item 2)                          | This can be costly to provide due to the required subsidy. Cannery Lofts has a per unit subsidy of about \$20,000, previously subsidy has been closer to \$100,000 per unit. |
| 3) Addressing Housing Needs of Very Low Income Households with Special Needs |  | Panelists discussed the need for special needs housing in this program so that needs are not overlooked by the market.  | Assess the need for special needs housing and incorporate it into new projects as needed, with the necessary services and oversight. Focus local resources (land and funding) on projects with these units. (Action Item 2) | This can be costly to provide due to the required subsidy. This housing type usually requires state or federal funding with a similar focus on special needs housing.        |

## Matrix of Affordable Housing Workshop Action Areas

### Workshop #2- Housing Constraints

| Action Area (Subject)                                      | Current Status  | Information Gathered/<br>Workshop Discussion   | Action Steps (Recommendation)   | Projected Cost   |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| 4) Availability of Affordable Housing Funding              | The City currently has negotiated acceptance of affordable housing in-lieu fees (amount and option) on a per project basis. The City is aware of new state funding sources and receives annual federal funding. | Various methods for calculating an in-lieu fee were discussed at the workshop, as well as the importance of the fee covering per unit cost. Panelists shared information about upcoming state funding for Transit Oriented Development and Veterans Housing Funds. There was also discussion about pending changes to tax credit financing.  | The City should develop a standard, adequate in-lieu fee with a defined application of the fee, by right if possible. (Action Item 3)<br>Staff and the City Council should actively engage in the development and changes to state and federal affordable housing programs with the goal of supporting program requirements that are compatible with local affordable housing development. (Action Item 4)  | Can be accomplished within existing budgeted staff time, but defers other affordable housing projects.   |
| 5) Availability of Land for Affordable Housing Development | The City currently has two land dedication sites (Woodbridge- 1 acre and Mace Ranch- 1.67 acres).   | Panelists discussed using proceeds from sale of one or both of these parcels to purchase units or land elsewhere, and discussed the importance of future land dedication sites. Panelists discussed a potential city assessment of affordable housing development on underutilized public sites (Train Depot, Civic Park, DJUSD site, etc.). | Maintain the land dedication option within the affordable housing ordinance. (Action Item 5)<br>Assess the value of the two sites owned by the city and opportunity for affordable housing development elsewhere. (Action Item 2)<br>Release multiple Request for Proposals (RFP) on both of the land dedication sites to measure development and/or acquisition interest on the sites. (Action Item 2)<br>Assess other opportunities for affordable housing development by redirecting existing resources. (Action Item 2) | This could vary greatly based on whether the city chooses to consolidate resources by selling land and based on subsidy requests within project proposals, which is also subject to availability of outside funding sources. |

## Matrix of Affordable Housing Workshop Action Areas

| Action Area (Subject)                     | Current Status   | Information Gathered/<br>Workshop Discussion   | Action Steps (Recommendation)   | Projected Cost   |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| 6) In-lieu Fee Option and Calculation     | Exists as an option to all developments as part of the 2013 Ordinance update.  | Various methods for calculating an in-lieu fee were discussed at the workshop, as well as the importance of the fee covering per unit cost. Developers stated the desire for increased certainty of fee amount and availability. | The City should develop a standard, adequate in-lieu fee with a defined application of the fee, by right if possible. (Action Item 3)   | Can be accomplished within existing budgeted staff time, but defers other affordable housing projects. |
| 7) Developer Certainty of AH Requirements | Some updates to the Affordable Housing Ordinance from 2013 require City Council approval (e.g. in-lieu fees and accessory dwelling units (ADUs)). This increases developer uncertainty.                    | Mentioned by stakeholders within the development community. Concerns regarding the ADU option were voiced by multiple participants.  | Consider 2013 updates to the affordable housing ordinance, and further consider areas for improvement, particularly focused on use of in-lieu fees, fee amount, and the ADU option. (Action Item 5) | Can be accomplished within existing budgeted staff time, but defers other affordable housing projects. |
| 8) Density and Universal Design           | Existing Universal Access policy works at balancing density and universal design features. Seems to be working well within development and has necessary Community Development Director exemption process. | Ongoing need to assess requirements and balance these objectives. Valuable to focus on accessibility within affordable housing projects where the city has additional influence and input in the matter.                         | Complete drafting of the Ordinance for the Universal Access Policy, as previously directed. (Action Item 6)   | Can be accomplished within existing budgeted staff time, but defers other affordable housing projects. |



## Matrix of Affordable Housing Workshop Action Areas

### Workshop #3- Inventory and Planning of Affordable Housing Resources

| Action Area (Subject)  | Current Status   | Information Gathered/<br>Workshop Discussion   | Action Steps (Recommendation)   | Projected Cost  |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| 9) New State Affordable Housing Funding Sources  | Staff is aware of upcoming changes and additions to existing affordable housing programs.  | Panelists shared information about upcoming state funding for Transit Oriented Development and Veterans Housing Funds. There was also discussion about pending changes to tax credit financing.        | Staff and the City Council should actively engage in the development and changes to state and federal affordable housing programs with the goal of supporting program requirements that are compatible with local affordable housing development. (Action Item 4)   | Can be accomplished within existing budgeted staff time, but defers other affordable housing projects.  |
| 10) Adequate Funding for Preservation of Existing Affordable Housing Units   | The city has set aside a little over half a million dollars of affordable housing funding for the preservation of Pacifico, Rosa Parks, Sojourner Truth, Sterling Court, and other aging units.  | Panelists agreed on the need for the preservation of existing affordable housing units, not only through enforcement but also through maintenance of housing quality by rehabilitating units.          | Continue to support the preservation of existing affordable housing units as a funding priority of the program and through completion of necessary housing rehabilitation. (Action Item 1)  | No additional cost at this time, dependent upon project proposals going forward.  |
| 11) Funding and Land for Affordable Housing Development, with a focus on Very Low Income and Special Needs Housing | The city has made progress on these needs in its most recent affordable rental projects (Cannery Lofts, New Harmony, Cesar Chavez Plaza, and Eleanor Roosevelt Circle), as these projects have focused on deeper affordability and some special needs housing. | Panelists discussed the long waitlist length for very low and extremely low income units, as well as the need to provide adequate special needs housing, not otherwise provided in the housing market. | Continue to support the development of affordable housing units to serve these groups not otherwise served. Assess the need for special needs housing and incorporate it into new projects as needed, with the necessary services and oversight. Focus local resources (land and funding) on projects with these units. (Action Item 2) | This can be costly to provide due to the required subsidy. Cannery Lofts has a per unit subsidy of about \$20,000 for a project that includes very low and extremely low income units. Special needs housing requires services funding, through state or federal funds. |

## Matrix of Affordable Housing Workshop Action Areas

|  |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| 12) Evaluation of Accessory Dwelling Units in Affordable Housing Ordinance | The option for the development of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) was added to the Affordable Housing Ordinance in August 2013 with a sunset date of December 2015. The option restricts this method to half of an affordable housing requirement, at a 50% per unit credit, with other development standards. | Panelists and community members voiced concern about the use of unregulated ADUs for the fulfillment of affordable housing requirements. Developers stated concern with the uncertainty of its availability to development proposals. | Consider 2013 updates to the affordable housing ordinance, and further consider areas for improvement, particularly focused on use of in-lieu fees, fee amount, and the ADU option. (Action Item 5) | Can be accomplished within existing budgeted staff time, but defers other affordable housing projects. |
|--|--|---|---|--|

### Summary of Action Area Items from Matrix:

1. Continue to support the preservation of existing affordable housing *properties* and units as a funding priority of the program and through city support in the completion of necessary affordable housing rehabilitation.
2. Focus local affordable housing resources (land and funding) on very low and extremely low income housing units, including the development of special needs housing as needed and as outside funding sources allow. Include evaluation of the two land dedication sites through an RFP process to evaluate feasibility of affordable housing development sites and value of land, including alternative use as a market rate development. Assess other opportunities *and underutilized sites* for affordable housing development by redirecting existing resources.
3. The City should develop a standard, adequate in-lieu fee with a defined application of the fee, by right if possible.
4. Staff and the City Council should actively engage in the development and changes to state and federal affordable housing programs, *including access to ensure the flow of information between the city and local advocacy groups*, with the goal of supporting program requirements that are compatible with local affordable housing development.
5. Consider existing Affordable Housing Ordinance and recent updates from 2013. As part of any updates, maintain land dedication *as the primary option*, and evaluate the use of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), availability of in-lieu fee option, and in-lieu fee amount calculation. *The Commission continues to have concerns with the actual and ongoing affordability of second units and their ability to provide fair housing that serves households in need, consistent with their February 2013 5-2 motion against amending the ordinance for this option of second units.*
6. Complete drafting of the Ordinance for the Universal Access Policy, as previously directed *in November 2012*.