



City of Davis
Social Services Commission Minutes
Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616
Monday, February 25, 2019 at 7:00 P.M.

Commission Members: Claire Goldstene, Chair; Donald Kalman; Susan Perez, Alternate; Ann Privateer; Kurt Snipes; Tracy Tomasky; Georgina Valencia, Vice Chair; R. Matthew Wise

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

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

1. Call to Order

Members Present: Claire Goldstene, Vice Chair; Donald Kalman; Susan Perez; Ann Privateer; Kurt Snipes; Tracy Tomasky, Chair; Georgina Valencia; and R. Matthew Wise

Also Present: Ginger Hashimoto, Management Analyst, City Manager's Office; Brett Lee, Mayor, Council Liaison; Eric Lee, Planner, Community Development and Sustainability Department; and Joan Planell, Social Services Consultant

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

2. Approval of Agenda

Tomasky moved to approve with agenda with a second by Snipes.

The motion passed by the following 6-0-0 vote:

AYES: Goldstene, Kalman, Privateer, Snipes, Tomasky, Valencia, and Wise

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

3. Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners, and Liaisons

Hashimoto announced that a new Commission email mechanism that auto-forwards messages directly to the entire Commission went live earlier in the month.

4. Public Comment

None.

5. Consent Items

A. Approval of Minutes—January 28, 2019

Goldstene requested two amendments: (1) fix "monetary" typo on page 3 and (2) add "identify other sources of funding for the Housing Trust Fund" to the list of ideas for the Commission's 2019 work plan.

Valencia moved to approve the amended minutes with a second by Kalman.

The motion passed by the following 6-0-0 vote:

AYES: Goldstene, Kalman, Privateer, Snipes, Tomasky, Valencia, and Wise

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

6. Regular Items

A. Affordable Housing Ordinance Amendment

Staff Presentation:

Lee provided an overview of the proposed changes to the City's Affordable Housing Ordinance related to allowing ongoing contributions to the Housing Trust Fund proposed by the 3820 Chiles Road applicant.

Public Comment:

Martha Teeter: Teeter expressed concern about the roughly \$100,000 annual contribution being too low to buy land and build housing, although she acknowledged the need for Housing Trust Fund revenue.

Matt Williams: Williams shared the results of his fiscal analysis comparing three scenarios: (1) land dedication, (2) one-time in-lieu fee, and (3) ongoing contribution. Williams explained that, the average compound growth rate of rent since 1975 according to UC Davis' annual survey is 5.26% per year. Using that growth rate and comparing it to the growth rate of the City's investments, both the land dedication and one-time in-lieu fee scenarios would effectively become \$0 by year 15, as opposed to the ongoing contribution, which would continue to grow over time as well as eliminate any impact of inflation.

Greg Rowe: Rowe clarified that at the February 13 Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Commission recommended approval of affordable housing plan contingent on the Social Services Commission agreeing. Rowe encouraged the Commission to adopt the proposed amendment. Rowe underscored the importance of adding another mechanism to generate revenue for the Housing Trust Fund. He suggested that in the first few years, the City could sell a bond to produce a few million dollars upfront to fund a project and then pledge the revenue of the project to pay off the bond.

Chuck Cunningham: Cunningham expressed his appreciation for the Commission's positive feedback in November when the Commission reviewed the initial proposal. Cunningham also explained that despite originally proposing two options, the City Attorney determined that the provision of moderate/median income units would require a Housing Element amendment in addition to an ordinance amendment.

Eileen Samitz: Samitz expressed general support for the idea of an ongoing contribution. Samitz cautioned, however, that the ongoing contribution should

not become the only option because land dedication is preferred. She recommended approving the option experimentally, but conducting more research.

Darryl Rutherford: Rutherford underscored the need for Housing Trust Fund money. Rutherford suggested the City could use the revenue to hire an in-house affordable housing specialist instead of contracting it out. He expressed, however, his disappointment in the process and that the City did not vet the idea more thoroughly.

Commission Questions:

Valencia asked for clarification on the City Attorney's determination regarding the Housing Element and ordinance amendments. The applicant/staff explained that in reviewing the original options: (1) provision of 34 on-site moderate/median income units or (2) an ongoing contribution to the Housing Trust Fund, the City Attorney ultimately determined that both required amending the affordable housing ordinance, but the moderate/median income units also required amending the Housing Element. Given the project's approval timeline and the arduous process involved with amending the Housing Element, the applicant decided to pursue the ongoing contribution option.

Valencia asked if staff researched whether other local jurisdictions have similar allowances in their inclusionary housing requirements. Lee answered that staff has not reached out to other communities.

Goldstene asked staff to clarify if there was a difference between the original proposal, which was to contribute the internal revenue subsidy of providing 34 moderate/median units, and the revised proposal, which was to contribute 1.65% of the project's total annual revenue. The applicant answered that there is no difference—the impetus for the change was to simplify the methodology used to make the annual calculation.

Goldstene clarified whether the amendment would expire in June 2019. Staff confirmed that it would, unless Council extends the sunset date without further amendments or directs staff to keep the ongoing contribution as a permanent option.

Commission Discussion:

The Commission discussion centered on the following notions:

- *Concern that the ongoing contribution will not generate enough money to build affordable units*
- *Concern that the ongoing contribution could set a bad precedent in that all applicants will select this option and no affordable units will get built*
- *Concern that the ongoing contribution as presented does not include a minimum annual contribution or floor*
- *Concern that the ongoing contribution was not thoroughly vetted and staff did not research whether other local jurisdictions allow this option*

- *Acknowledgement that the ongoing contribution will provide much needed resources to the Housing Trust Fund, but the City likely needs to reassess how it manages and appropriates Housing Trust Fund dollars such as having the Social Services Commission review proposed uses prior to Council budget approval, developing priorities, and imposing a cap on use for staff time/administration*
- *Acknowledgement that the ongoing contribution is part of an interim measure set to expire in June 2019 with the opportunity for further information and analysis if made permanent*

Wise moved to approve the proposed ordinance amendment with two changes to the language: (1) Establish a floor/minimum annual contribution and (2) Clarify that the “ongoing payment” means a payment in perpetuity, with a second by Snipes.

The motion failed with a tied vote of 3-3-1:

AYES: Snipes, Valencia, and Wise

NOES: Goldstene, Kalman, and Tomasky

ABSTAIN: Privateer

Of those voting against the motion, one commissioner opposed the amendment in favor of on-site units and the other two commissioners needed more information.

**B. Homeless Services Update and City Council Discussion Debrief
Staff Presentation:**

Hashimoto shared that unfortunately Ryan Collins fell ill and could not attend the meeting. Hashimoto provided a brief presentation about the four components of DavisPathways, which included the following:

- ***Police Services Specialist Supervisor***—Homeless Outreach & Services (Police Supervisor –Homeless Services)—a City-funded position meant to engage persons experiencing homelessness, facilitate appropriate service linkages, as well as participating in Continuum of Care system-level planning.
- ***Pathways to Employment***—a jobs training program that employs homeless individuals for up to 12 hours per week to beautify the downtown
- ***New Pathways***—a four-bed short-term supportive housing program
- ***Getting to Zero Vouchers and Case Management***—a rental assistance voucher program paired with supportive services

She also shared a summary of the City Council’s February 19 discussion on the City’s overall strategy to reduce homelessness, which included the following:

- **Research the concept of establishing a pilot respite center**—the notion proposes to establish a pilot respite center offering day shelter, showers, laundry, as well as cabins for overnight emergency shelter.
- **Evaluate how the City can support the Interfaith Rotating Winter Shelter (IRWS)**—after being operational for 12 years, the IRWS is experiencing volunteer burnout and is requesting assistance from the City. The IRWS would like the shelter to be at one location and would like a van to transport shelter guests.
- **Convene a community summit on homelessness**—the summit would bring all stakeholders together to discuss the state of homelessness in Davis and potential solutions.
- **Update the homeless component of the City’s Social Services Strategic Plan to align it with the County’s recently adopted No Place Like Home Strategic Plan**—the homeless component of the City’s existing Social Services Strategic Plan is outdated, particularly because Yolo County recently adopted a new strategic plan to address homelessness. This could potentially occur following the community summit.
- **Establish a volunteer pathfinder program to constitute a fifth component of the DavisPathways programming**—the volunteer pathfinder program would train community residents about available social services and enable them to serve as “pathfinders” to engage persons experiencing homelessness.

Public Comment:

Martha Teeter: Teeter introduced herself as a member of Davis Opportunity Village (DOVe)—a local nonprofit dedicated to serving individuals experiencing homelessness. Teeter explained that DOVe is exploring new ideas and research.

Matt Williams: Williams expressed his view that the community needs to galvanize and rally around the issue of homelessness.

Linda Scott: Scott introduced herself as a member of the IRWS. Scott reiterated that the IRWS is experiencing volunteer burnout, particularly with volunteer drivers and overnight attendants. Scott also mentioned that the IRWS is seeing lower enrollment this year. She surmised the drop may be attributable to people not wanting to leave their belongings.

Commission Questions/Discussion:

Mayor Lee shared some additional information about the respite center concept. Lee explained the concept would consist of two components (1) a day center consisting of a trailer and basic need amenities such as showers, bathrooms, as well as laundry and (2) an overnight component consisting of tent cabins. Lee reiterated that the concept is not supposed to be a long-term program, but a pilot to test and potentially demonstrate that this could be an immediate way to address the crisis, while more permanent supportive housing

is built. Lee acknowledged this would just be one small piece of the larger solution.

Goldstene asked if the City envisioned paying staff. Lee answered yes, he envisions some paid staff particularly for overnight attendants, but expects a mix of volunteers and other social services providers to be onsite during the day.

Planell explained that preliminary 2019 sheltered and unsheltered point-in-time count numbers suggest a 25% increase from 2017 numbers (2017=146 and 2019=186).

Goldstene asked if staff is concerned about whether relying on grant funding is a risk. Planell answered yes, staff acknowledges it is risky, but there are numerous upcoming state funding opportunities for homeless services.

Valencia asked if the City could bridge the gap between the federal maximum voucher rate and market rate for Getting to Zero rental assistance payments. Planell replied that while she would confirm with Yolo County Housing, she believed that doing so would be against the law.

Perez expressed that while she appreciated the performance measure statistics, she would also like to hear about personal stories, which could help to humanize homelessness.

C. Draft 2019 Social Services Commission Work Plan

The Commission collectively decided to delay the item until a later meeting.

7. Commission and Staff Communications

A. Development Project Update.

Hashimoto reiterated that the 3820 Chiles Road development project is tentatively scheduled to appear before the City Council on March 19.

B. Social Services Commission Long Range Calendar

Hashimoto reviewed the planned long range calendar items planned for March.

8. Adjourn

Tomasky moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:42 p.m. with a second by Kalman.

The motion passed by the following 6-0-0 vote:

AYES: Goldstene, Kalman, Privateer, Snipes, Tomasky, Valencia, and Wise

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None