City of Davis
Social Services Commission Minutes
Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616
Monday, October 15, 2018 at 7:00 P.M.

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

Council Liaison: Brett Lee, Regular; Dan Carson, Alternate

Staff: Ginger Hashimoto, Administrative Analyst, City Manager's Office

---

Please note: The numerical order and estimated time lengths of items on this agenda is for convenience of reference; items may be taken out of order. No new items shall begin after 9:00 p.m. unless consent exists to continue.

1. **Call to Order & Roll Call**
   Members Present: Tracy Tomasky, Claire Goldstene, Georgina Valencia, Ann Privateer, Donald Kalman, R. Matthew Wise

   Members Absent: Bernita Toney

   Also Present: Dave Campbell, Affordable Student Housing Task Force Chair and Associate Dean of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, UC Davis; Matt Dulcich, Local Government Relations Manager, UC Davis; Emily Galindo, Interim Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, UC Davis; Ginger Hashimoto, Management Analyst; Katherine Hess, Community Development Administrator; Rob Saper, Graduate Student Researcher, UC Davis; Kelly Stachowicz, Assistant City Manager

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

2. **Approval of Agenda**
   Valencia moved to approve the agenda with a second by Goldstene.

   The motion passed by the following vote:

   AYES: Goldstene, Kalman, Privateer, Tomasky, Valencia, and Wise
   NOES: None
   ABSTAIN: None

3. **Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners, and Liaisons**
   None.

4. **Public Comment**

None.

5. Consent Items

A. Approval of Minutes – September 17, 2018

Valencia requested clarification on two points she thought warranted more specificity:

- *For the CAPER item, Valencia asked that staff note the discussion around the $200,000 Housing Trust Fund contribution to the BerryBridge project*
- *For the Downtown Plan item, Valencia asked that staff note the points raised in the memorandum she submitted on suggested housing policy changes*

Goldstene moved to approve the amended minutes with a second by Privateer.

The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Goldstene, Kalman, Privateer, Tomasky, Valencia, and Wise
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None

6. Regular Items

A. 1770 Research Park Drive Affordable Housing Plan

Katherine Hess, Community Development Administrator: Hess described the project as a mixed-use development comprised of four four-story apartment buildings with research/tech space on the ground floor of each building. She explained that even though the project is currently exempt from inclusionary requirements because it is vertical mixed-use, the applicant is proposing eight or five percent very-low-income units in order to obtain a CEQA exemption.

Dave Nystrom, Fulcrum Properties Applicant Team Member: Nystrom provided further background information about the project.

Commission Questions:
The Commissioners and staff/applicant exchanged the following questions and answers:

Kalman asked how the potential changes to the City's affordable housing requirements will affect this project especially if the City removes the vertical mixed-use exemption or if the City could require higher than 5%. Staff answered that the City Council will need to decide how staff should handle applications submitted prior to requirement amendments.

Goldstene asked about the project's review timeline. Staff answered that they are currently working through the analysis to complete the CEQA streamlining determination. As such, staff does not anticipate convening a public hearing before the Planning Commission and City Council until early 2019.

Goldstene asked the applicant to clarify the first sentence in the qualifying criteria section which states the "affordable housing program will be open to individuals who qualify for conventional affordable housing, as well as individuals who may not qualify for such housing. The applicant confirmed this is a mistake and a holdover from a previous student-oriented affordable housing plan.

Valencia asked what will happen if the applicant cannot find qualified renters for the affordable units. Staff replied recently approved student-oriented housing projects included a requirement for the payment of in-lieu fees as a contribution to the Housing Trust Fund if the applicant could not find qualified renters because they were by-the-bed and by-the-bedroom leases, but this has not historically been a provision included in traditional unit leases. Valencia reiterated that she believes it is important to plan for the future because market conditions could change and adding verbiage to address this concern and ensure a potential contribution to the Housing Trust Fund is important.

Wise asked if the affordable units be integrated. The applicant replied yes.

Wise asked if the project is dependent on any city funds. The applicant replied no.

Public Comment:
Eileen Samitz: Samitz strongly urged the Commission to hold off issuing any recommendations until the Commission can make a fully informed decision. She described feeling as if the City has fast-forwarded a lot of projects and she wants the Commission to get more information. Samitz also described the project as a give to get with giving some affordable housing in order to get out of doing an environmental impact report.

No Name Given: Person suggested that the Commission consider lowering the income threshold.

Commission Discussion:
Individual Commissioners discussed their thoughts including the fact even though the site is currently underutilized and the Downtown Plan efforts want to encourage redevelopment and support innovation businesses, they are not necessarily comfortable with the affordability component. Some Commissioners also expressed that with the impending release of the economic analysis the Commission would be remiss to issue recommendations without knowing the report's findings.

Kalman issued the following motion, but the motion did not receive a second:

- *Delay issuing any recommendations and request the project return to the Commission after the City figures out its affordable housing ordinance amendments*

Valencia issued the following motion with a second by Privateer:

- *Require the applicant to lease the affordable units to a qualified renter*
- *Establish a plan for what will happen if the applicant cannot find a qualified renter including a contribution to the Housing Trust Fund*
- *Add an additional 5% (8) low-income units in the same diversity/composition as the 5% (8) very-low-income units—making the overall affordability 10% (5% very low and 5% low)*

Goldstene issued the following friendly amendment with acceptance by Valencia (maker) and Privateer (seconder):

- *If the impending economic analysis recommends a percentage higher than 10%, then the Commission would like to see the higher percentage of affordability met.*

The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Goldstene, Privateer, Tomasky, Valencia, and Wise
NOES: Kalman
ABSTAIN: None

B. UC Davis Chancellor's Affordable Student Housing Task Force Presentation

Matt Dulcich, Local Government Relations Manager, UC Davis: Dulcich explained that in February 2018 Chancellor May established three task forces to examine the issues of affordable student housing, food security, and mental health care. Dulcich elaborated that given the Social Services Commission purview of advising the City Council on affordable housing matters, staff invited representatives from the affordable student housing task force to make an informational presentation on their recently issued report.

Dave Campbell, Task Force Chair and Associate Dean for Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, UC Davis: Campbell provided an overview of data collected and examined for the report. He then reviewed the task force's 19 recommendations, which include:

1. *Create a leadership team to implement the recommendations*
2. *Establish an ongoing forum with city/regional leaders to address shared interests in affordable housing, sustainable transportation, etc.*
3. *Identify funds to support affordable housing*
4. *Monitor trends with yearly survey and other data*

5. *Limit enrollment increases*
6. *Increase the campus housing supply*
7. *Design for affordability*
8. *Adjust financial aid calculations*
9. *Advocate to bring the ratio of TA/GSR salaries to rental cots into affordable alignment*
10. *Provide emergency housing services*
11. *Establish ombudsperson/call line for tenant/landlord issues*
12. *Create financial/rental literacy programs for students*
13. *Improve roommate matching programs*
14. *Reestablish campus Community Housing listing service*
15. *Provide incentives for landlords to become "Aggie preferred" partners*
16. *Increase financial aid office staff support*
17. *Keep Solano Park open as long as possible with appropriate repairs*
18. *Provide better transportation options for students, faculty, and staff living outside of Davis*
19. *Develop and build a cooperative housing facility with professional management*

Commission Discussion:
The Commission thanked the University representatives for presenting.

Valencia asked the University to describe their current campus housing options.

Emily Galindo, Interim Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, UC Davis: Galindo responded the University has its residence hall program that consists of approximately 6,000 beds, which is primarily geared toward first-year students because the University guarantees housing for all incoming freshmen. The remaining 4,000 beds are comprised of various buildings operated by public-private partnerships.

Valencia asked whether the University offers any bedroom leases as opposed to unit leases and whether the University has encountered any problems with that lease style. Galindo answered yes, some projects are leased by the bedroom. Galindo said that while that leasing style allows for more control, bedroom leases also require more staffing to resolve conflicts among renters.

Goldstene asked the representatives to elaborate on which recommendations they already made progress on. Campbell answered that as part of the recently executed MOU with the University, City and County, the entities agreed to convene an ongoing forum and to develop an annual report. Campbell reiterated that some of the recommendations such as the housing services programming are longer-term and will take some time to develop. Dulcich also added that with the completion of the University's Long Range Development Plan, the University is prioritizing the acceleration of housing production and hopes to add 6,000 new beds as soon as possible.

Goldstene asked if there is a provision in the new MOU to ensure the University constructs all of the promised housing. Dulcich answered that there is a provision that the University will issue payment to the City and County if the 6,000 beds are not completed to help offset the resulting external impacts.

Privateer asked about the potential closure of Solano Park. Galindo answered that the University intends to keep the facility open until there is a viable alternative.

Kalman asked about how the University advocates for fair and affordable financial aid packages to ensure students can afford housing. Campbell replied that this is an area where the University needs to do more research to understand how they can conduct effective advocacy. Galindo added the University is examining whether to institute a program to potentially provide housing subsidies to students in need.

Goldstene asked if the University has plans to address the housing needs of staff and faculty. Dulcich answered there is a 500 bed West Village staff/faculty project that has been stalled for several years, but the project is included in the Long Range Development Plan.

Public Comment:
Eileen Samitz: Samitz expressed her appreciation for the University's intentions, but asserted that UC Davis violated the 1989 MOU. Samitz expressed her desire for the University to take primary responsibility for creating the housing crisis in Davis. She questioned why UC Davis cannot meet the 50% on-campus housing threshold because all of the other UC campus can. She also questioned why the University is not doing higher density projects.

No Name Given: Person questioned the vacancy rate of West Village.

7. Commission and Staff Communications

A. Development Project Update.

Stachowicz provided an update on Pacifico. She explained the project is comprised of four buildings—two are occupied and two are closed awaiting rehabilitation. Stachowicz further elaborated the buildings began as dorm-style cooperative student housing, but the building foreclosed and the City ultimately inherited the property. She explained that the City contracts with Yolo County Housing to manage the buildings which currently houses low-income individuals and that recently Yolo County Housing in partnership with the Yolo County Health and Human Services Agency held some community meetings to discuss the potential of utilizing some of the buildings to provide mental health and/or residential treatment services. At this time, Stachowicz explained the City has not received an application from the County for this proposed use. In addition to those efforts, Yolo County Housing and the Police Department are working on potential mitigation measures to address community concerns about the current tenants.

B. Social Services Commission Work Plan.

The Commission asked for more information about the timeline for pending development projects. Staff agreed to devise an information sheet depicting the overall flow and estimated timeline for the development review process depending on the various scenarios.

The Commission discussed the possibility of moving the November meeting since it will occur during the week of the Thanksgiving holiday. The Commission ultimately decided not to move the meeting.

8. Adjourn

Tomasky adjourned the meeting at 9:26 p.m.