



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

**Monday, November 16, 2009**

**7:00 p.m.**

**Community Chambers**

**23 Russell Blvd.**

**Davis, CA 95616**

**Social Services  
Commission Members**

**Present:** Eric Gelber, George T. Hague (Vice Chairperson), Cathy Huff, Jan Solorzano, Liz Yeh (Alternate), Dan Wolk

**Absent:** Vanessa Robinson (Chairperson) - excused

**Council Liaison:** Lamar Heystek, Don Saylor (Alternate)

**Staff:** Danielle Foster, Housing and Human Services Superintendent  
Patrick Conway, Administrative Analyst II - Housing Programs  
Bob Wolcott, Principal Planner

- 
- 1. Called to Order at 7:03pm by Vice Chairperson G. Hague.**
  - 2. Approval of Agenda.**  
C. Huff moved to approve the agenda. E. Yeh seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
  - 3. Approval of Draft Minutes from September 21, 2009 meeting.**  
D. Wolk moved to approve the minutes. G. Hague seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with E. Yeh abstaining.
  - 4. Public Comment.** There were no public comments.
  - 5. Commissioner and Staff Communications:**  
D. Foster explained that the City Council did not approve the Mace Parke project due to cost increases and project model modifications from the original proposal.  
  
D. Foster stated the dates of city office closure during Thanksgiving.

**6. Business Items:**

**A. Senior Housing Strategy Recommendations to City Council**

B. Wolcott provided a staff report on the history related to this discussion and summarized data on senior population projections provided in the Bay Area Economics (BAE) report. Staff went on to explain that this information was then used to create senior housing strategies and summarized each of those strategies. Staff further explained how each assumption could alter projections and strategies on senior housing.

**Public Comments**

Don Villarego (CHA) provided information to the Commission and stated that the BAE population estimates are far below the senior population increases from 2000 to 2008. He said that they are twice as large. He also stated disagreement with a senior housing to population equilibrium in the city and disagreed with a lack of housing provision for senior relatives of Davis residents. He also stated disagreement with assumptions used in the report challenging that persons want to stay living in their homes as the age.

Mary Jo Bryant (CHA) summarized the purpose and goals of CHA, to see increased housing options for seniors in Davis. She added that 1,100 people have attended CHA focus groups, and 300 individuals have joined the organization. They support universal design in projects.

After the public comments, the Commission was requested to provide comments and make recommendations on the following chart regarding the Senior Housing Strategy:

Aspects of Draft Strategies	Commission Comments and Recommendations
<p><b>Overall strategy process</b> (1) Generally OK? Or what should be done differently?</p> <p><b>Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <i>How many and when?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>What types?</i></li> <li>▪ <i>How to locate, plan and design?</i></li> </ul> <p>(2) Are these the appropriate issues? (recognizing you may have comments on the draft strategies) Do you recommend that other issues be addressed? What issues?</p>	<p>Individual comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Taking as a “given”, limited to senior housing in isolation to overall needs, support services, infrastructure, and other housing needs. Senior needs are not necessarily different from those of ages 54 and below. Does not consider other housing needs within the community.</li> <li>2. Recognize that most seniors age in place.</li> <li>3. To require “universal design”, is City limited by State law? How? Is it limited to a checklist? Did these limitations result in the accessibility and visibility policies?</li> <li>4. Disappointed in not more emphasis on renovations and assisting retrofits to existing homes. Easily added to policies, add to question (3) below.</li> <li>5. Provide low interest loans to renovate homes.</li> <li>6. Emphasis on renovation would impact proposed strategies. If not, then the strategies should be called “new housing”.</li> <li>7. Delete strategy 2 (general proportions of different types of units), and 3.3 standards (sizes of age-restricted projects).</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Stay at conceptual level. Follow data to support “aging in place” both at home and in Davis.</li> <li>9. Strategies are constrained by the narrow focus on age-restricted housing, instead of how to meet needs.</li> <li>10. Deal with in strategies: 1) general directions; and 2) numbers.</li> <li>11. This emphasis is on what has happened. We should think about different, innovative ideas like in CHA report (transportation, etc).</li> </ol> <p>General consensus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Too much emphasis on age-restricted housing numbers and not enough on facilitating “aging in place” and renovations of existing homes including: assisting retrofits, low interest loans, new innovative programs, etc.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Emphasis on 55+ age-restricted senior housing</b> (including 55+ age-qualified) as one of the major strategies?</p> <p><b>(3)</b> Agree with emphasis on age-restricted housing as one of the major strategies? Is 55+ the appropriate age range for consideration?</p> <p>Do you recommend other strategies not related to age-restricted senior housing? What strategies? (eg higher city standards for “universal design”?)</p>	<p>Individual comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do not tie to numbers. Look at input from CHA report: Transportation and transit should be more available and accessible (eg shuttle to/from hospital, shopping areas, social activities, etc).</li> <li>2. Overall strategy should take into account transportation.</li> <li>3. Age-restricted housing can preclude other groups. In some cases are warranted (eg assisted living, continuing care). Active adult housing should be integrated with other types of housing, little justification to exclude other groups.</li> <li>4. Disappointed in not more emphasis on renovations and assisting retrofits to existing homes. Easily added to policies.</li> <li>5. CHA report says people want multiple generations in their neighborhood.</li> <li>6. CHA report should be put into plan as an attachment.</li> <li>7. See suggestions about renovation of existing homes in (1) above.</li> <li>8. 10 sites should be looked at.</li> <li>9. May need some centralized planning for critical mass for services that appeal to seniors.</li> </ol> <p>General consensus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Too much emphasis on age-restricted numbers. Look at what people wanted in the CHA report including transportation.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Strategy 1: Targets for the number</b> of new 55+ age-restricted senior housing units.</p> <p><b>(4)</b> Existing unmet need: Agree with general methodology (p.8) and determination of 200 units?</p> <p><b>(5)</b> Agree with assumptions for target?</p> <p>(a) 1% growth - Any comments to Council?</p> <p>(b) Student population in city is kept stable.</p> <p>(c) Shifts in age brackets assume age groups in city mirror trends in County overall.</p> <p>(d) Target based on 15.3% of households with at least one senior person.</p> <p><b>(6)</b> Target: Agree with amount of 1,000 units / 20 years (average of 50 units / year) and to distribute over time?</p>	<p>Individual comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Numbers should be looked at, but re-visited at least every five years.</li> <li>The target number is fairly speculative. If adopted, keep general and not hard and fast. Look beyond age-restricted housing and consider other community housing needs as well.</li> <li>Having a hard number could give too much weight and could be used inappropriately.</li> <li>The assumptions don't matter if the number is questioned.</li> <li>A number could be manipulated and sites should not be specified.</li> <li>We must have some numbers as a basis.</li> </ol> <p>General consensus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If numbers are used, keep general and re-visit at least every five years.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Strategy 2: General proportions of different types</b> of new 55+ age-restricted senior housing units.</p> <p><b>(7)</b> Agree with concept to distribute unit types?</p> <p><b>(8)</b> Agree with general methodology of moving closer to national percentages as a rationale for distributing units types? If not, what?</p> <p><b>(9)</b> Agree that this is a general goal but not an absolute "cap" or minimum for any given year?</p>	<p>Individual comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop places that people can afford.</li> <li>Strive for "aging in place" as well as age-restricted housing.</li> </ol> <p>General consensus (unanimous):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Address needs for different size units, affordability, and accessibility.</li> <li>Remove a strategy with numbers of different housing types. Provide strategies and programs to enable "aging in place" such as low-cost retrofit loans, utilities subsidies, etc. Do not focus on just age-restricted units, but different types of housing are needed.</li> <li>Look favorably on plans that include smaller units that can accommodate seniors.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Strategy 3.1: Adopt and implement the "Guidelines for Housing that Serves Seniors and Persons with Disabilities".</b></p> <p><b>(10)</b> Agree?</p>	<p>Individual comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will these guidelines affect affordability?</li> </ol> <p>General consensus (unanimous):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes, adopt and implement.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Strategy 3.2: Consider sites as potentially suitable</b> for age 55+ senior housing, subject to additional review. (11) Agree with identifying this list for further review? (Including that this does not mean site must be developed with senior units with or without age-restrictions, or preclude other sites being considered.)</p>	<p>Individual comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Target areas that might be appropriate.</li> <li>2. Look at including the other suggestions in other items above.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Strategy 3.3: Establish guidelines</b> for the review of a proposed age-restricted development project or component of a project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Minimum size:</b> 16 units.</li> <li>b. <b>Maximum size:</b> 250 units.</li> <li>c. <b>Maximum size for one general housing type and density:</b> 150 units.</li> </ol> <p>(12) Agree with concepts of these guidelines and their sizes?</p>	<p>General consensus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide a minimum size that creates the economic base to support a project and its services.</li> <li>▪ Establish a maximum size that maintains a sense of community.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Other comments or recommendations</b></p> <p>(13) Do you have any other comments or recommend any other strategies? Recognizing any concerns stated above, can the Commission proceed with making comments and recommendations to Council on the draft strategies?</p>	<p>Individual comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hesitant to be this far ahead (20 years) on numbers and locations.</li> <li>2. Provide different sizes, services, and retrofit loans for fixing existing houses.</li> </ol> <p>General consensus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Not comfortable with focus on age-restricted but may need some numbers (see comments above).</li> <li>▪ Focus should be on “aging in place” gracefully through programs such as: utility bill subsidies, different unit sizes (focus on smaller), reducing restrictions and barriers on second units and additions, helping with renovations, etc.</li> <li>▪ Lack of comfort is discussing one housing need in a vacuum without consideration of others.</li> </ul>

Other comments made by the Commission regarding the Senior Housing Strategy included:

- The strategy needs to connect with services and it lacks coordination with countywide services.

- It lacks mental health and drug addiction services.
- It does not address transportation matters.
- It should also address barriers to housing - credit checks, rental history, etc.

No other action was taken by the Commission.

**B. CDBG and HOME Critical Needs for Program Year 2010-2011**

P. Conway presented the updated Critical Needs List to be used in consideration of funding recommendations for the 2010-2011 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) Request for Proposal process. Staff stated that direct services are still to be given the highest priority for funding and that only minor changes have been made from the previous year's critical needs list. Staff recommended that the Commission recommend to the City Council adoption of the CDBG and HOME Critical Needs List for the 2010-2011 program year.

E. Gelber moved to approve the recommendation. J. Solorzano seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**C. Draft 10-Year Plan: One at a Time: Ending and Preventing Homelessness for Yolo County Residents (2010-2020).**

Bridget DeJong, a consultant from HomeBase, reviewed the various sections of the draft countywide plan for ending and preventing homelessness for Yolo County Residents. The Commission was requested to provide questions, comments and changes on the plan, and make recommendations to the City Council on the countywide plan.

D. Wolk moved to recommend the plan be sent to City Council for approval. C. Huff seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**D. Schedule and Workplan.**

The Commission discussed its desire to participate in a workshop on affordable housing with the City Council. No other changes to the workplan were made and it was approved by consensus.

7. **Adjournment.**

C. Huff moved and D. Wolk seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 pm. The motion passed unanimously.

Submitted by

Patrick Conway  
Administrative Analyst II - Housing Programs