



City of Davis

Social Services Commission Minutes

Community Chambers, 23 Russell Boulevard, Davis, CA 95616

Monday, November 20, 2017

7:00 P.M.

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

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

Members Present: Claire Goldstene, Ann Privateer, Tracy Tomasky, Bernita Toney, Georgina Valencia, and R. Matthew Wise

Members Absent: Donald Kalman and Kurt Wendlenner

Also Present: Lisa Baker, CEO of Yolo County Housing; Robb Davis, Mayor; Ash Feeney, Assistant Community Development Director; Ginger Hashimoto, Administrative Analyst; Katherine Hess, Planning Administrator; Ike Njoku, Planner; and Kelly Stachowicz, Assistant City Manager

Tomasky called the meeting to order at 7:07pm.

2. Approval of Agenda

Goldstene moved to approve the agenda, with a second by Toney. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Brief Announcements from Staff, Commissioners, and Liaisons

Stachowicz introduced Ginger Hashimoto, who will eventually staff the Commission.

4. Public Comment

Eileen Samitz warned the Commissioners of the overabundance of mega-dorm style projects. She explained that these four to five bedroom apartments only work for students. Therefore, Samitz urged the Commissioners to support the building of more traditional one, two, and three bedroom apartments because they are inclusive of all community members.

5. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of Minutes – October 16, 2017

Wise and Goldstene requested to remove two incomplete sentences.

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

AYES: Goldstene, Privateer, Tomasky, Toney, and Wise

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: Valencia

B. Critical Needs 2018-19

Stachowicz and Baker provided a brief overview of the critical needs. Baker explained that since the needs must closely align with the City's consolidated plan, they remained largely unchanged from last year. Stachowicz noted that per the Commission's recommendation, however, staff reprioritized prevention and intervention as the highest need.

Goldstene asked staff to better advertise this year's CDBG/HOME request for proposal opportunity. She also requested that the process be more accessible for smaller organizations.

Wise moved to approve the Critical Needs for 2018-19 and recommend City Council adoption, with a second by Valencia. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Regular Items

A. West Davis Active Adult Community

Katherine Hess, Planning Administrator: Hess shared an overview of the proposal. Hess reminded Commissioners that they already provided preliminary recommendations in March. As such, the purpose of this review is to make formal recommendations for consideration by the Planning Commission and City Council.

David Taormino, Developer: Taormino underscored that the proposal includes 150 affordable senior apartments, which is twice as many affordable units as required by City code.

David Thompson, Neighborhood Partners: Thompson explained Neighborhood Partners' role, as the agency responsible for developing and financing the senior apartments. Thompson outlined the need for low-income senior housing, citing that a recent review of the City's inventory identified 208 units with a combined waiting list of 423 persons.

Public Comment:

Eric Gudz: Gudz acknowledged that affordability is a complex policy issue. He urged the Commissioners to disburse affordable units throughout the project, rather than concentrate the affordable units in one area.

Mary Jo Bryan: Bryan expressed her support for the project, particularly because it provides housing diversity for individuals who want to downsize.

Commission Discussion:

Privateer asked if there were ways to limit waitlist eligibility or prioritize individuals who already live or are from Davis. Stachowicz responded that federal and state fair housing laws govern the restrictions that the developer can impose.

Valencia asked if there was information on where the people from the waiting lists are coming from. Thompson replied that although the housing projects focus their advertising in Davis, it varies.

Valencia also asked if the average income of \$8,000 to \$10,000 per year is typical for the population. Baker answered that a person receiving SSI equates to approximately \$10,000 per year. She elaborated that in Yolo County about 26% of residents currently live under the poverty threshold. Thus, an income of less than \$10,000 per year is common.

Goldstene asked what happens in the event that the developer does not secure enough funding. Hess responded that while the City has yet to finalize the details for this proposal, it is typical for the City to either institute a phased approach and/or institute a provision where the land reverts to the City should the developer fail to secure funds by a certain date.

Goldstene also asked the developer why he could not institute an income-based fee to allow the senior renters access to homeowner association amenities. Thompson replied that due to administrative challenges and the concern about pricing seniors out, the best solution is allow access on an individual, ability-to-pay basis.

Goldstene also expressed concern about the separation between the affordable units and the market ownership units, as all the affordable units are located on Covell Boulevard. Taormino explained the design grants seniors easy access to transportation. In addition, the taller buildings located on the edge of the property makes good design sense, given its proximity to the University retirement community building, which is of similar size and scale.

Commission Motion:

Valencia moved that the Commission find the proposal to be consistent with the City's affordable housing ordinance, with a second by Wise. The motion passed unanimously.

Goldstene moved that the Commission issue the following additional recommendations, with a second by Wise:

1. Require the developer to implement a sliding scale fee for senior renters who wish to utilize homeowner association amenities
2. Require the developer to more fully integrate the senior renters with the market rate homeowners

The motion passed unanimously.

B. Cannery Mixed Use Proposal

Item deferred to December 4 meeting.

C. Public Hearing: Lincoln40 Housing Development

Tomasky opened the public hearing.

Ike Njoku, Planner: Njoku provided an overview of the project. Njoku explained that the developer changed the proposal from paying in-lieu fees to establishing program for low-income students called LincolnLift. The program will consist of 71 fully integrated, rent restricted beds that shall remain affordable in perpetuity. Njoku expounded LincolnLift will feature two tiers. The first tier will restrict 57 or 80% of the affordable beds for students who qualify as very low-income, which is 30% of 50% of the area median income for a one-bedroom occupant. The second tier will restrict 14 or 20% of the affordable beds for students who qualify as low-income, which is 30% of 60% of the area median income for a one-bedroom occupant.

Ash Feeney, Assistant Community Development Director: Feeney elaborated on Njoku's report by providing a comparison of the Lincoln40 project to a similar student housing project just approved by Council called Sterling. Feeney noted a significant difference is that Lincoln40 is proposing to rent by bed, while Sterling will rent by bedroom. Feeney concluded that despite some differences, both projects have a similar percentage of affordability with Lincoln40 at 16% and Sterling at 17%.

Paul Gradeff, Developer: Gradeff provided a more detailed overview of the project. He emphasized that the concept of bed rentals/double-up units is affordable by design. He estimated that the bed rental option is about 20% cheaper than unit rentals.

Vanessa Errecardi, Developer Representative: Errecardi explained the purpose of the LincolnLift program is to provide private housing subsidies to low-income students who do not qualify for public housing subsidies.

Public Comment:

Adam Mottafy, Student: Mottafy underscored the City's low vacancy rate and argued that if the City cannot stop UC Davis' growth than the City needs to grow with UC Davis.

Maya Dravosa, Student: Dravosa stated housing is a major issue and a financial burden for students. Dravosa expressed support for the project.

Benjamin Cadranell, Works with Foster Youth, Attorney: Cadranell shared the statistic that only 1% of foster youth graduate from college. Cadranell expressed support for the project.

Francois Keeblen, Student: Keeblen reiterated that Davis has a housing problem and students need housing. Keeblen expressed support for the project.

Lauren Kabantok, Student: Kabantok shared a story about her friend who was an international student and did not have financial aid. She explained the student lived in his car and got sick.

Adilla Jamaludin, Student and ASUCD Vice President: Jamaludin shared that students on campus are working on housing issues too. For example, the student government oversees a housing task force, offers housing navigation services for students struggling to find off-campus housing, and provides legal services for students facing housing-related issues.

Maya Adjo, Graduate Student and Graduate Student Representative: Adjo reiterated that housing is difficult to obtain and students have many financial obligations.

Marcelo, Student: Marcelo stated that housing in Davis is expensive and there is less of it than in a metropolitan area.

Elizabeth, Student: Elizabeth described how she is being gentrified out of her apartment by a bad landlord. She urged the Commissioners to support the project.

Donald Gibson, PhD Student and Chair of GSA/ASUCD Housing Task Force: Gibson shared his struggle to find housing as a young professional. As a result, he relocated to Sacramento, despite wanting to remain the Davis. Gibson expressed his support for the project and particularly applauded the rental of beds over units as a helpful option for young professionals.

Bonipak, Graduate Student: Bonipak underscored the importance of affordable housing. Bonipak shared that he is currently living in Solano Park and the City's needs more housing projects similar to Solano Park.

Eric Gudz: Gudz applauded LincolnLift as an innovative program. Nonetheless, he encouraged the Commissioners to review how the developer arrived at the 71-bed calculation.

Lindsay Durras: Durras described how her family commutes to Davis from Dixon often for church, school, and outings. She expressed her support for the project as a way to prevent investors from purchasing other types of housing and pricing out young families on single incomes.

Perla, Transfer Student: Perla reiterated the rising cost of housing and how landlords take advantage of students. She expressed support for the project.

George Via, Transfer Student: Via shared his story as a member of a low-income family, who struggled to find housing. Via expressed his support for the project.

Susan Ranier, Architect: Ranier expressed her frustration with UC Davis for not keeping up with their obligation to provide housing. She disliked the developer's proposal to include a bathroom for every bedroom. She also asked why the developer could not provide specifics on rental rates.

Olivia Grey, Student: Grey shared her experience living in cooperative housing. She explained that while cooperative housing is good for low-income students, it is contingent upon completing 20 hours of community services per week, so it is not for everyone. She expressed her support for the project.

Eileen Samitz: Samitz expressed her concern that UC Davis is not producing enough student housing. She asserted that four and five bedroom apartments are not flexible. She also questioned who would regulate and monitor the LincolnLift program.

No name given, Student: Student shared his story of living with six other people in four-bedroom house. He explained that one person even lives in the garage without HVAC and another fellow student he knows is living out of his van.

Nema Killeen, Transfer Student, ASUCD: Killeen reiterated that housing is difficult to find for students and encouraged support for the project.

Nancy Price: Price urged the City to view the issue of student housing needs within a broader context. She argued the need for a model lease, rent control, and design guidelines for mega-dorms.

David Greenwald: Greenwald expressed his support for the project because not enough apartments have been built to accommodate UC Davis' growth in the last 10 years. He added that students do not object to living in mega-dorms.

Commission Comments:

Valencia asked if the program is privately administered, how the City would know if the program is working and how the program would be monitored. Feeney responded that the City would maintain the authority to conduct audits and monitor the program. Stachowicz added that the City has other privately administered programs and the developer is proposing to submit an annual report.

Valencia inquired as to whether other developers have tried similar programs for low-income students. Feeney responded that he is unaware of whether similar programs exist.

Goldstene asked if there were any legal issues around restricting who can live in the housing. The developer's attorney, Karen Tiedeman, confirmed her comfortability with the legality of the proposed program. She explained that in her assessment, the program complies with state and federal fair housing laws. Additionally, her analysis revealed no anticipated disparate impact on any protected classes.

Goldstene inquired about how the developer arrived at the 71 affordable bed total. Gradeff answered that he based the calculation on the City's direction for onsite units as well as Sterling's affordable housing proposal.

Valencia asked for clarification on the rental rate amounts. Gradeff answered the rates would be 50% of area median income for 80% for the beds, which would equate to approximately \$675 including furnishings and utilities and 60% of area median income for 20% of the beds, which would equate to approximately \$800 including furnishings and utilities. Baker confirmed that these rates are commensurate with other affordable housing programs.

Toney asked if the developer would take into consideration student needs and costs, such as books for classes. Feeney replied that is yet to be determined.

Toney asked if the developer would maintain a waitlist. If so, then she inquired about how the developer would manage a waitlist. Gradeff answered that the program will manage a waitlist, but the specifics of how have yet to be determined.

Lastly, Toney asked for more detail about what constitutes an overutilization of utilities. Gradeff replied that the provision's aim is to encourage the conservation of energy, but the exact amount is yet to be determined.

Goldstene asked if the City could require more than 71 affordable beds. Feeney replied yes.

Mayor Robb Davis reminded the Commissioners about the housing workshops held in recent months. Mayor Davis reiterated that the Council is less interested in collecting in-lieu fees. He also explained the City is currently reviewing reasonable inclusionary requirements with a consultant.

Goldstene commented that overall she is not supportive of this type of student housing oriented project because it is not flexible for all community members. She underscored her preference for standard apartment complexes. Nonetheless, she expressed that if the project design remains, then she wants an increase in the number of affordable beds.

Tomasky agreed with Goldstene in that she dislikes the inflexibility of the project design. Tomasky urged the City to develop better design guidelines for these types of housing projects.

Wise disagreed explaining that not every project can provide housing for all community members. He elaborated that the Olive Drive location is a desirable placement for student housing as it is close to the University. Wise continued that he liked the double occupancy option, as it is affordable by design. Wise also applauded the developer for proposing an innovative affordable housing program as opposed to paying in-lieu fees.

Commission Motion:

Valencia moved that the Commission issue the following recommendations, with a second by Privateer:

- 1. Require the developer to make an upfront contribution to the City's Housing Trust Fund*
- 2. Require the developer to amend the marketing window for the affordable beds from 30 days to 60 days*
- 3. Require the developer to increase the number of affordable beds dedicated to the LincolnLift program*

The motion passed by the following vote:

AYES: Goldstene, Privateer, Tomasky, Toney, and Valencia

NOES: Wise

ABSTAIN: None

Wise explained his "no" vote is because he is supportive of the affordable housing proposal in its current state.

7. Commission and Staff Communications

Stachowicz reminded members that the next meeting is on December 4, rather than December 18. At the meeting, Commissioners will review the Cannery Mixed Use Proposal first and then the Nishi Proposal.

8. Social Services Commission Work Plan

Commissioners requested no changes to the work plan.

9. Adjourn

Tomasky adjourned the meeting at 10:40 p.m.
