



City of Davis

Social Services Commission Minutes

Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616

Monday, December 18, 2017

7:00 P.M.

Commission Members: Claire Goldstene, Vice Chair; Donald Kalman; Ann Privateer; Tracy Tomasky, Chair; Bernita Toney; Georgina Valencia, Alternate, Kurt Wendlenner; R. Matthew Wise

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

Members Present: Claire Goldstene, Donald Kalman, Ann Privateer, Tracy Tomasky, Bernita Toney, Georgina Valencia, and R. Matthew Wise

Members Absent: Kurt Wendlenner

Also Present: Robb Davis, Mayor; Ginger Hashimoto, Administrative Analyst; Katherine Hess, Planning Administrator; Eric Lee, Planner; and Kelly Stachowicz, Assistant City Manager

Tomasky called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

Goldstene moved to approve the agenda, with a second by Wise. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners, and Liaisons

Stachowicz announced City Hall will be closed from Monday, December 25, 2017 through Monday, January 1, 2018 in observance of the holidays. She also highlighted two agenda items set to appear before the City Council on December 19: (1) a public hearing for the CDBG and HOME critical needs list/authorization for RFP distribution and (2) an informational update on the City's efforts to reduce homelessness.

Mayor Robb Davis added the Council is also set to discuss potential revenue measures for the June 2018 ballot, which includes a proposed social services tax. Mayor Davis also informed Commissioners about the recently approved homeless services project for the interfaith rotating shelter. Providing more robust services, the pilot program will feature onsite medical care and referrals, case management referrals, and connections to public assistance.

Goldstene asked staff whether the information included in the homeless services update was new. Stachowicz replied that the content is largely information already shared with the Commission. Stachowicz explained that the City's Social Services Consultant, Joan Planell, is set to receive subcontractor performance measure reports in January. Thereafter, Planell can provide the Commission with a more detailed update on the City's homeless services programming in February.

4. Public Comment

Susan Rainier: Rainier expressed her opposition to the Nishi proposal and listed numerous reasons why the site is unsafe for residential living. As opposed to housing, Rainier suggested that the land be used for a solar farm.

Eileen Samitz: Samitz warned the Commissioners of the overabundance of mega-dorm style projects. She explained that these four to five bedroom apartments only work for students. Therefore, Samitz urged the Commissioners to support the building of more traditional one, two, and three bedroom apartments because they are inclusive of all community members. She also expressed her frustration that UC Davis is not building enough on campus student housing.

Ellie White and Emily No Last Name Given: As graduate students at UC Davis, White and Emily urged the Commissioners to join them in pressuring the University to build more affordable housing for students with families. They explained that the only existing project is Solano Park, which does little to meet the demand.

5. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of Minutes – November 20, 2017

Kalman and Goldstene requested two corrections.

Valencia moved to approve the amended minutes, with a second by Toney. The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Goldstene, Privateer, Tomasky, Toney, Valencia, and Wise

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Kalman

6. Regular Items

A. Cannery Mixed-Use Proposal

Eric Lee, Planner: Lee shared a brief overview of the proposal, explaining that the applicant is seeking to add 54 residential units to its mixed-use commercial site. Lee elaborated that this addition requires an update to the applicant's approved affordable housing plan. He further explained that if one takes into account the 17-credit overage in the applicant's approved affordable housing plan, the resulting deficit is two affordable housing units. He reiterated staff is seeking a recommendation as to whether the proposed affordable housing addendum is consistent with the approved affordable housing plan.

Public Comment:

None.

Commission Discussion:

Valencia stated that the proposed changes may require an amendment to the developer agreement, which in turn opens the discussion to add more affordable units.

Goldstene stated that she views the requested amendment as independent of the existing project. Therefore, rather than two affordable units, she favors a higher number of affordable units—a number that more closely aligns with 35% of 54 rather than 35% of the entire project.

Wise articulated his disagreement, citing that not taking into account the existing 17-credit overage is changing an agreement reached in the past. He asserted this is not a good way to set policy. He also expressed concern about losing credibility and deterring development.

Commission Motion:

Valencia moved that the Commission recommend the applicant build nine affordable units with five units at the low-income level and four at the very-low income level, with a second by Goldstene.

The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Goldstene, Kalman, Privateer, Tomasky, Toney, and Valencia

NOES: Wise

ABSTAIN: None

Wise explained his “no” vote is because he is supportive of the proposed affordable housing addendum in its current state.

B. Nishi Student Apartment Proposal

Katherine Hess, Planning Administrator: Hess shared an overview of the Nishi student apartment proposal, a revision from the proposal that residents voted down in June 2016. Hess explained the new proposal includes a residential component, a commercial component, and an open space component. Hess elaborated that unlike most other proposals, the applicant is seeking early feedback. Thus rather than formal recommendations, staff and the applicant want general input to improve the preliminary proposal before it is finalized. The primary areas of focus include the number of affordable beds, the location of affordable beds, and the overall level of affordability.

Public Comment:

Larry Guenther: Guenther expressed his support for integrated affordable housing.

Tim Ruff: Ruff introduced himself as the applicant. He acknowledged that Davis is experiencing a housing shortage and explained his belief that providing student housing will free up other housing stock. Ruff continued by addressing several concerns expressed by community members.

Linda Deos: Deos encouraged the Commissioners to recommend increasing the percentage of affordable beds, integrating the affordable beds, and expanding the target population beyond students.

Eileen Samitz: Samitz questioned why the applicant has not conducted air quality studies to determine whether the location is safe for residential use. She also questioned the low percentage of affordable units and the legality of the proposal.

Nancy Price: Price expressed her concern about whether the Commission would have the opportunity to comment on the affordable housing plan again prior to City Council review.

Commission Discussion:

Valencia asked staff to research if other communities have implemented similar proposals and to identify successes and/or challenges.

Wise asked the applicant for more information about unit breakdown. Russ responded the preliminary breakdown is approximately 700 units with a mix of two bedroom, one bathroom units; two bedroom, two bathroom units; four bedroom, two bathroom units; and four bedroom, four bathroom units.

Kalman asked the applicant why the development is for student housing. The applicant responded that he given the land's proximity to campus, he believes student housing is the most logical type of development.

Goldstene addressed each discussion area by stating the following:

- *The number of affordable beds should be increased. She underscored her concern that the applicant used numbers from the Lincoln40 development to arrive at their affordable calculation and she does not want others to assume Lincoln40 set a good precedent.*
- *The units should be integrated*
- *All income levels regardless of extremely low, very low, or low should count for the same credit*
- *There should be a subsidy for parking fees*

Goldstene concluded by noting her concerns about the legality of targeting the student population as well as numerous other issues not addressed by the preliminary proposal such as who would administer the affordable housing program, what would the City's involvement be in monitoring the program, and what happens if students cannot be identified to fill vacant beds. Overall, Goldstene requested that the proposal return to the Commission once finalized. She also underscored the challenge in providing feedback on a vague proposal and stressed that no one misconstrue this initial input as her support of the proposal.

Valencia concurred with Goldstene that full integration and a parking fee subsidy are favorable. She also emphasized the need for varied unit types to accommodate people with differing needs such as families.

Kalman conveyed his thoughts about the City's affordable housing shortage and the complex relationship with UC Davis. Kalman also agreed with Goldstene that it is difficult to comment on the proposal because it was so vague and amorphous.

Wise agreed that responding to an unfinished proposal was challenging. He expressed that while integrated beds are ideal; he acknowledged the impact on affordability. He also acknowledged that he trusts that the City Attorney's Office is thoroughly vetting the legality of the proposal and understands the logicalness of targeting students given the land's proximity to campus. Additionally, Wise noted that since the City is awaiting a consultant report to inform potential updates to the City's affordable housing ordinance, it is difficult to determine the appropriateness of affordability.

While the Commission did not reach consensus on all points discussed, Tomasky summarized the conversation by stating the following:

- *The number of affordable beds needs to be increased to as close to 35% as possible*
- *Staff needs to conduct research on whether other communities have implemented similar proposals—particularly the rent by bed model*
- *Favor not limiting the target population to students*
- *Oppose using Lincoln40 as a model*
- *There was not consensus on whether rental by beds versus rental by units is preferred*
- *Favor integration whenever possible*
- *Support providing a parking fee subsidy*
- *Request to comment on the affordable housing proposal again prior to City Council review*

7. Commission and Staff Communications

Stachowicz reminded members that the next meeting is on January 22, as the fourth Monday in January is Martin Luther King Jr. Day.

8. Social Services Commission Work Plan

Commissioners requested no changes to the work plan.

9. Adjourn

Tomasky adjourned the meeting at 8:57 p.m.