



**Social Services Commission Meeting
Meeting Minutes
Monday, September 16, 2024
7:00 P.M.**

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

Members Present: Rachael Fulp-Cooke, Deanna Sverdlov, Judith Ennis, Judy Wong-Chen, Sarah Brown-Blake, Tracy Ligtenberg, Chris Ringer (alternate), Justine Villanueva (7:14pm).

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Dana Bailey, Director Social Services and Housing
Iris Grace, Affordable Housing Manager
Jennifer Block, Management Analyst

Chair Rachael Fulp-Cooke called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

2. Approval of Agenda

Approval of the agenda was moved by Sverdlov, with a second by Fulp-Cooke. Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Fulp-Cooke, Sverdlov, Ennis, Wong-Chen, Brown-Blake, Ligtenberg

NOES: None

ABSENT: Villanueva

3. Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners, and Council Liaisons

Commissioners provided introductions.

4. Public Comment

None

5. Consent Calendar

A. August 1, 2024 Special Meeting Commission Minutes

Wong-Chen made one correction to the motion to approve the HOME-ARP where both the motion and second is listed as made by Ennis. Staff will make the correction.

Approval of the amended August 1, 2024 Special Meeting minutes was moved by Fulp-Cooke, with a second by Sverdlov.

AYES: Fulp-Cooke, Sverdlov, Ennis, Wong-Chen

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Brown-Blake, Ligtenberg

ABSENT: Villanueva

6. Action Items

A. Palomino Place Project Affordable Housing Plan

Sherri Metzger, Community Development Director – Provided an overview of the Palomino Place project. Community Development is recommending approval of 45 multi-family dwelling affordable units and is seeking a recommendation from the Social Services Commission (SSC) on the affordable housing component. The recommendation from the SSC will go to the Planning Commission. The final EIR and project plan will be prepared for consideration by the Planning Commission.

Iris Grace, Affordable Housing Manager – Social Services and Housing Staff have reviewed the Palomino Place project and is recommending that the project be conditionally approved with the 45 affordable units and asks that the developer comes back with additional information once plans are finalized. The conditional approval recommendation is due to the EIR not being complete and the design map is not finalized so the unit specifics such as square footage are unclear.

Public Comment:

Matt Keasling, Taylor, Wiley & Keasling – Provided an overview of the Palomino Place project.

Jeff Stalnick, Senior Citizens Commission Member – Would like to see the project have units for low-income individuals, especially senior citizens.

Discussion:

Commission members questioned whether or not some of the other units such as the cottages could be considered for low-income housing instead of all the low-income units being located in the four-story building.

Commission members also had questions on building aesthetics and ADA accessibility for the four-story building proposed for low-income housing.

There was a motion by Brown-Blake to recommend that the Planning Commission conditionally approve Affordable Housing Plan #06-23 for the Palomino Place Subdivision Project (PA #22-45), seconded by Ennis. Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Fulp-Cooke, Sverdlov, Ennis, Wong-Chen, Brown-Blake, Ligtenberg, Villanueva

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

There was a motion by Ligtenberg to recommend to the Planning Commission that the Palomino Place Affordable Housing Plan should provide an additional 12-units for a total of 45 affordable units, seconded by Brown-Blake. Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Fulp-Cooke, Sverdlov, Ennis, Wong-Chen, Brown-Blake, Ligtenberg, Villanueva

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

There was a motion by Sverdlov to recommend condition approval of the project based on: 1. Developer provides a comprehensive AHP to encompass mitigating factors/conditions of environmental review, 2. Developer provides design map with site specific location and square footage allocation based on bedroom size, second by Fulp-Cooke.

Motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Fulp-Cooke, Sverdlov, Ennis, Wong-Chen, Brown-Blake, Ligtenberg, Villanueva

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

7. Discussion Items

A. Consider Council Subcommittee Proposed Process to Place Tasks/Items on Commission Agendas

Kelly Stachowicz, Assistant City Manager – Presented the Council Subcommittee’s proposed process to place tasks/items on commission agendas. The process is proposed and staff are currently presenting to all commissions and gathering input and feedback on the proposed process.

Public Comment:

Jeff Stalnick, Senior Citizens Commission Member – Expressed concern in regards to the proposed subcommittee process.

Dan Carson, Former City Council Member – Expressed concern in regards to the proposed subcommittee process.

Discussion:

Commission members questioned the rationale of the change and what the City is trying to achieve with the change. (Stachowicz – More consistency in communications, and equity between all commissions).

Commission members questioned whether there may be other solutions besides the new proposed process. (Stachowicz – As an advisory council the commission can propose variations of what is currently being proposed).

Liaison Josh Chapman – Spoke on why the proposed changes were made including making sure commission items go through a vetting process and also making sure commission time is well spent and valuable.

Commission members remarked that the Social Services Commission members stay within the commission purview without having a requirement and feel that all the proposed processes do not seem necessary.

Commission members asked for clarity on the types of resources being requested and used on subcommittees. (Stachowicz – Staff time and City funds)

Commission members questioned whether or not the proposed process would keep the commission from forming a subcommittee. The Social Services Commission creates subcommittees to discuss items in further detail. The time spend on subcommittees has always been on commission members' own time and no extra staff time has been needed. The Social Services Commission members expressed that they are doing work that is meaningful and impactful and feel that not all commissions need a vetting process.

Commission members questioned whether there would be a delay in subcommittee work waiting to get permission even if work is being done in the purview of the commission and expressed that commission work should be uninhibited.

It was mentioned that the language in the proposed process is unclear and it was questioned on whether or not everything would need to be reviewed by City staff or Council liaisons as first step? (Staff and council liaison would be the first step)

It was asked whether a first step could be made instantaneously in a meeting with City staff and the Council Liaison so there would be no delay? (This is a possibility, but is still being decided)

B. Affordable Housing Program Year Objectives

Iris Grace, Affordable Housing Manager – Presented the FY2024-25 Affordable Housing objectives and recommendations for the Social Services and Housing Department. Items that were reviewed included SSH affordable housing goals, housing continuum focus and affordable housing development funding including federal, state, local and private/public partnerships. Recommendations included exploring opportunities that would bridge the gap of affordable housing units with more affordable housing developments and coordination of housing stock for permanent supportive housing and affordable rental units.

Public comment:
None

Discussion:
Staff asked for a clarification on why the City did not apply for HCD funding this year. (Grace – The City is not in position to apply for this funding cycle).

There was several questions and extensive discussion about the housing trust fund including the city housing trust fund versus private housing trust funds for the city, in lieu of fees, earmarking housing funds to ensure they are correctly budgeted and used, and restricted accounts for the city fund.

There was a question about the goal to explore new services to support affordable housing. (This goal is for permanent supportive housing. The City does not provide direct services, they receive funds and pass them through to organizations and non-profits who

provide these services. City staff are looking at funding streams and trying to have continued awareness of funding available to support affordable housing).

C. Citizen Participation Plan

Dana Bailey, Director Social Services – The City is in the process of updating the Consolidated Plan for 2025-2030, which is required by HUD and will assist in planning for the next five years. Dana discussed the purpose, goals and the process including the first step being the Citizen Participation Plan. Working with RDA Consulting, City staff will be doing community outreach including forums and focus groups to get information on housing needs and to engage the community. The data collected will be used by RDA Consulting to draft a plan that will be brought back to the Social Services Commission, then City Council for review and approval.

Public comment:

None

Discussion:

There was a question on whether or not the Consolidated Plan would overlap with the General Plan update? (Dana – Yes, staff will be sharing data to have in both plans).

There was a question about vulnerable neighborhoods in the City and outreach. (Bailey - RDA Consulting will also be looking at secondary data on top of engaging a variety of different people throughout the community).

There was a question about how the City was planning to engage the different language populations in the City. (Dana – City staff will be working with a translation service to get documents translated to the needed languages).

D. 2023-2024 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER)

Dana Bailey presented the Draft 2023-24 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER), the annual year end reporting for Consolidated Plan goals and accomplishments.

Public Comment:

None

Discussion:

It was asked whether or not staff had any personal reflections on the project metrics and goals achieved? (Bailey – The amount of funding provided to each entity is really low and the organizations are struggling with staffing and capacity. With these struggles there is a lot of adjustments. See these things in performance reporting is informing staff of current trends and of what is coming in the future).

Ennis mentioned a few global edits and will follow-up with City staff.

It was mentioned that money for minority and women owned businesses. Is there a way we can do more outreach moving forward? (Bailey – The City has a new Economic Development Manager which staff will be working with to do further outreach).

8. Regular Items

A. FY24-25 Planning and Long-range Calendar

Dana Bailey gave an overview of the Long-Range Planning Calendar and asked for thoughts and review on format, language, possible standing items, and holidays. Discussion will take place at the next meeting.

Public comment:
none

B. Liaison Reports

Liaison Reports will continue for 2024-25 CDBG. Dana will send out a list of funded projects to commission members so everyone can decide who will report on which project.

Public comment:
None

9. Commission and Staff Communications

A. Development Projects and Affordable Housing Properties Update

There are five for sale properties on the market, of those five two are in contract.

B. Social Services and Housing Department Update

Respite Center

The Respite Center has had support from many community organizations. HEART of Davis came out and added a shade structure and members of the Lutheran church brought improvements including new paint and furniture. Plans to release an RFP for the ADA accessibility project are pending.

Homelessness

The Homeless Strategic Plan is complete. Council approved the Plan in July 2024 and staff will work with the community to develop a working group to make the plan actionable.

The Point-in-Time (PIT) Count numbers have been finalized. The numbers are slightly down from the previous count from 181 to 161. Dana will send additional information to commission members.

Pacifico

The County is moving forward with the rehabilitation of two buildings. The city is looking at other two buildings.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:52pm.