



City of Davis

Social Services Commission Minutes

Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616

Monday, January 22, 2018

7:00 P.M.

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

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

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

Members Absent: Claire Goldstene

Also Present: Lisa Baker, Executive Director, Yolo County Housing; Robb Davis, Mayor; Ashley Feeney, Community Development and Sustainability Director; Ginger Hashimoto, Administrative Analyst; Joan Planell, Social Services Consultant; and Kelly Stachowicz, Assistant City Manager

Tomasky called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

Valencia moved to approve the agenda, with a second by Kalman. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners, and Liaisons

Hashimoto reminded Commissioners that the CDBG and HOME application deadline was January 22. Hashimoto explained staff anticipants holding the public hearing for funding recommendations at its March 19 meeting.

Valencia encouraged Commissioners to attend an upcoming Davis Futures Forum on February 7 focused on housing. She explained that the forum would feature a presentation by David Garcia, Policy Director at the UC Berkeley Turner Center for Housing Innovation, followed by a panel discussion with several housing experts.

4. Public Comment

None.

5. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of Minutes – December 18, 2017

Valencia and Wise requested the following three amendments to the minutes:

- *Revise page 2, 6A Valencia comment to include her point that the proposed changes may require an amendment to the development agreement, which in turn opens the discussion to add more affordable units.*
- *Revise page 5, Wise comment to include his point that the Commission is awaiting the consultant's report and without the consultant's recommendation, it is difficult to evaluate appropriate levels of affordability.*
- *Revise page 5, Tomasky summary to clarify that the listed points did not imply the Commission reached consensus, rather it was a reiteration of all points discussed.*

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

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

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Wendlenner

6. Regular Items

A. Paul's Place Presentation

William Pride, Maria Ogrydziak, and Martha Teeter, representatives from the nonprofits Davis Community Meals and Housing and Davis Opportunity Village, delivered a presentation on their planning application to demolish the existing homeless services facility located at 1111 H Street and construct a new multi-functional facility. Significantly expanding the breadth of services currently offered, the proposed four-story facility would feature:

- *18 units of permanent supportive micro-housing;*
- *10 units of transitional housing;*
- *4 emergency shelter beds; and*
- *Enhanced day services including expanded shower, restroom, and laundry facilities.*

Public Comment:

Nan Rowen: Rowen expressed her support for the proposal. She applauded the vertical micro-housing concept. She also commended the addition of 18 permanent supportive housing units, as it will help alleviate critical housing shortages in the City.

Connor No Last Name Given: Connor expressed his appreciation for the proposal, particularly for the project's commitment to permanent housing and Housing First initiatives. He also underscored his desire to rely less on

conventional policing models and more on community-based models to conduct outreach and connect individuals with services.

Stefan Harvey: Harvey explained that as a volunteer cook for Davis Community Meals and Housing and as a member of the Unitarian Universalist Church who heard a presentation about Paul's Place the previous day, she is enthusiastically supportive of the project.

Tracy Dewit: Dewit stated her support for the project as she values caring for the community's most vulnerable residents. She also shared an idea to potentially accept donated cars or train cargo boxes and use them as a temporary place for individuals experiencing homelessness to spend the night and feel safe as well as secure.

Commission Discussion:

Wendlenner asked for clarification regarding the beds dedicated for use by the Police Department. Pride responded that while the precise details have not been determined, the intent is to reserve the four emergency shelter beds for individuals referred by the Police Department. Wendlenner followed by asking whether there has been discussion about prioritizing individuals with repeated calls for service. Pride answered not yet.

Wendlenner asked about entrance criteria such as prioritizing individuals from Davis as opposed to other parts of Yolo County. Pride answered again that many of the programmatic details have not been determined. Wendlenner also asked whether the project would operate as a clean and sober facility. Pride answered that while that is yet to be determined, the current program does require sobriety, primarily due to the shared living setup.

Valencia applauded the idea, but asked about the project's financing. Planell responded that two entities have expressed interest in making large financial contributions. Additionally, Planell explained the nonprofits plan to launch a fundraising campaign, which includes seeking financial or in-kind support from local businesses and community members. Planell noted the applicants have already been successful in accomplishing this by having Pride donate the land, Ogrzyziak donate her architectural expertise to design the building, and Harrison Construction agree to construct the building at cost. In terms of post-construction operation costs, Baker reminded the Commissioners that Davis Community Meals and Housing already receives funding to administer similar programming that can be transferred to the new facility.

Tomasky commended the applicants for the innovativeness of the project and the attention paid to the quality of living for its residents.

Wendlenner underscored that it would be helpful to have more information and answers to the questions he posed earlier in order to provide more feedback.

Wise complimented the applicants' efforts thus far, but agreed with Wendlenner that the Commission will be interested in hearing more about the service delivery methods as the project evolves.

B. Proposed Amendment to the Affordable Housing Ordinance for Multifamily Rental Developments

Ash Feeney, Community Development and Sustainability Director described a proposed amendment to Article 18.05. Feeney explained the proposed amendment grants the City Council temporary discretion to approve affordable housing plans until staff completes a comprehensive update of its inclusionary housing ordinance.

Public Comment:

Alan Pryor: Pryor expressed his adamant opposition to the proposed amendment. Pryor explained his opposition is because the consultant's report is not complete and therefore taking any action would be premature. He also questioned why staff did not anticipate the overturning of the Palmer decision and asserted this action unfairly benefits certain developers. He concluded by urging the Commission to reject the amendment until the consultant's report is complete.

Matt Williams: Williams expressed his opposition to the proposed ordinance amendment. He urged the Commission to wait until the final consultant report is complete in order to make a fully informed decision.

Linda Deos: Deos concurred with the previous commenters about her opposition to the proposed amendment. She explained that recently she has observed numerous projects proceeding without a fully developed proposal. Deos encouraged more transparency and urged the Commissioners to wait until the consultant's report is complete.

Eileen Samitz: Samitz expressed her strong opposition to the proposed amendment. She underscored her concern about removing the 35% requirement language. She also stated staff should have anticipated the overturning of the Palmer decision. Samitz echoed the previous commenters that action is premature without the consultant's report. She concluded by stating that the projects under current review should not be fast-forwarded, and expressed her view of the proposed amendment as poor planning.

Nancy Price: Price stated her support for the points made by previous commenters. In addition, Price articulated her support for the letter submitted to Commissioners by Samitz because it included illuminating data. Price also asked staff when the City commissioned the consultant study and when the City expects the final report to be complete. Price concluded by underscoring the importance of meeting broad-based community need.

Commission Discussion:

Valencia explained the difficulty in making salient comments or informed decisions without the consultant's report. Alternatively, Valencia applauded the efforts to update the housing ordinance as the current language lacks definition. Valencia further elaborated her desire for staff to analyze the bed-based affordable housing plans proposed by Lincoln40 and Nishi. She explained that while innovative, the proposals are not a proven concept and therefore she urged for further examination.

Wise asked if staff knows when the consultant report will be ready. Feeney replied that staff is currently working through preliminary findings and anticipates a final draft in two to three months. He underscored the complexity of undergoing this comprehensive update. He explained that the objective is to not only ensure the production of diverse housing stock, but also devise a wide-range of options to address the dynamic housing proposals developers are submitting.

Wise clarified whether the proposed amendment is a temporary change until the City is ready to institute a comprehensive update. Feeney confirmed the intent is for the proposed amendment to be a transition or bridge ordinance until a comprehensive update is ready. Wise asked if staff considered incorporating a sunset provision into the amendment, as there is nothing in the current language that indicates its temporariness. Wise also noted the provision could incentivize staff and Council to act in a timely manner. Feeney acknowledged that should the Commission decide to recommend a sunset provision it is something staff would consider incorporating.

Wise asked how staff determined the eight factors listed on page five of the proposed amendment. Feeney answered that staff and City Attorney staff identified the factors; however, they are open to Commission recommendations.

Wise concluded by clarifying that the 35% threshold is still the affordability goal, but it is not mandatory. Feeney confirmed that as correct.

Wendlenner asked if the City is modelling the proposed approach after another community. Feeney answered no, because there is not a statewide requirement for inclusionary housing. Rather it is about what is appropriate for the local jurisdiction.

Wendlenner further clarified if staff drafted the amendment in response to a particular development project or in response to a more general community need. Feeney answered the amendment was in response to the state's passage of the affordable housing package—particularly AB 1505.

Wendlenner concluded by asking staff for any additional comments on whether to wait for the consultant's report to be complete. Feeney responded that rather than rush a comprehensive update, it is his recommendation to continue thoughtful work with the consultants over the next few months, while also not prohibiting Council from taking action on projects ready for review. Feeney

further noted that during this interim period should the proposed amendment be enacted, the consultant would review every affordable housing proposal and prepare a memorandum assessing the appropriateness of affordability based on the results of their preliminary analysis.

Kalman asked staff to provide an overview of upcoming projects and whether the projects will create a diverse housing stock that will benefit the community. Feeney replied yes. Given the City's current vacancy rate of 0.4% and massive housing shortage, he explained that any housing would benefit the community.

Kalman also asked staff to talk about the 8,500 units included in UC Davis' long-range development plan. Kalman concluded by asking staff if they have a concern that the City is weighting development for students and neglecting other sectors of our community. Feeney responded that the amendment might arguably help the entire community by creating more stock.

Wise redirected the discussion back to the notion of adding a sunset provision. He asked staff what an appropriate sunset date would be. Feeney answered that a conservative estimate would be December 31, 2018. He explained this would allow for ample community dialogue and time for a comprehensive update.

Tomasky concurred with previous commenters who expressed concern about making a premature decision without the consultant's report because it calls into question the integrity of hiring the consultants before they release their findings. Tomasky underscored that waiting three months is not a lot of time when making decisions with long-range implications. Tomasky further expressed concern about the lack of transition or bridge language within the proposed amendment. Tomasky concluded by stating that the charge of the Social Services Commission is to ensure the best interests of those who are vulnerable and she does not believe that approving the amendment is the right thing to do.

Valencia asked if the City needs to take action to be in legal compliance. Feeney answered that if the City takes no action; all applicants must comply with the 35% standard, which given the recent history is untenable.

Wise expressed his support of the bridge ordinance as a prudent way to continue reviewing development applications, while simultaneously preparing a more comprehensive update.

Kalman disagreed, stating he views the proposed amendment as a way to eliminate affordable units, thereby giving money to developers.

Wise moved to approve the proposed amendment with the addition of a sunset provision of December 31, 2018, with a second by Wendlenner.

Valencia moved to amend Wise's motion to strike the following language appearing on Page 5, Section B of the proposed amendment—"including but

*not limited to providing affordable housing by bedroom or individual bed.”
Wise, the maker of the motion, rejected Valencia’s move to amend his original
motion.*

The motion failed by the following vote:

*AYES: Wendlenner and Wise
NOES: Kalman, Privateer, Tomasky, Toney, and Valencia
ABSTAIN: None*

*Valencia moved to approve the proposed amendment with the addition of a sunset
provision of December 31, 2018 and strike the language stated above from Page 5,
Section B. The motion failed, after not receiving a second.*

Kalman moved to reject the proposed amendment, with a second by Toney.

The motion passed by the following vote:

*AYES: Kalman, Privateer, Tomasky, and Toney
NOES: Valencia, Wendlenner and Wise
ABSTAIN: None*

7. Commission and Staff Communications

*Tomasky requested that staff be more vigilant about how Commission discussions are
portrayed in staff reports. Specifically, Tomasky noted differences in how staff described the
discussion on Lincoln40 in the Social Services Commission minutes as opposed to the Planning
Commission staff report.*

*Stachowicz assured Tomasky that staff would seek cross-Commission review of staff reports to
ensure they accurately capture the gestalt of the discussion.*

A. Social Services Commission Workplan

Commissioners requested no changes to the work plan.

8. Adjourn

Tomasky adjourned the meeting at 9:33 p.m.