1. Recap Mithum Workshop
   a. Strongest preferences
      • Flooring other than carpet
      • Laundry in the unit: especially important for parents with special needs kids; doesn’t seem to raise the marginal cost by much
      • Soundproofing: prevent noises from the bathroom being heard in other rooms of the unit, and so residents in differing units don’t hear noise from neighbors
      • Be clear as to what utilities are included in the monthly cost and what is not. There was a strong preference by some to have internet service be from the campus and included in the monthly cost so there would be access to library and research resources from home (seamless service between central campus to housing).
   b. Other preferences
      • Upgraded kitchen
      • Additional storage: Solano Park offers a good amount; doesn’t have to be more than that
      • Laundry in unit
      • Sustainability: LEED platinum is seen as a “minimum” given the sustainability culture and reputation of the campus. Discussion about this topic included: community garden, rooms with ceiling lights so that residents don’t have to buy/plug in lamps to illuminate a room, and using the weather to our advantage by orienting units for sunlight and having two windows in the units so that a breeze could pass through (less reliance on heaters and air conditioners).
      • Variety of unit sizes: possibly include a few studios and 3-bedroom units in addition to 1- and 2-bedroom units.
   c. Debated preferences
      • Outdoor social space: group wasn’t sure what a social space for non-families would look like. Maybe that population would like an outdoor space that is not a playground. Another suggestion was to have exercise stations around the playground to form a workout circuit. ([https://calisthenics-parks.com/spots/1814-en-davis-california-fitness-trail-exercise-parcours](https://calisthenics-parks.com/spots/1814-en-davis-california-fitness-trail-exercise-parcours))
      • If an amenity is offered on campus (e.g., gym, study lounges), it doesn’t need to be replicated within the housing complex.
      • Pet-friendly: Concern that if there is a “no pets” policy, residents will claim the animal as disability assistance and there will be a number of
animals anyway. Current issues at Solano Park include cat and dog hair in the laundry machines, and aggressive animals that can jump patio fences. One solution is to have a building or section of the complex that is pet-friendly, but away from child play areas. While exact policy preference was unclear, there seems to be consensus that this is an area of concern and there is a need for clarification.

- **Dishwasher**: split between the conveniences of having a dishwasher versus having the storage space in place of a dishwasher. Brief discussion as having dishwashers as an optional upgrade available in some units but not others.
- **Bathtubs**: was unclear if the assumption is that all units will have tubs; could be important for family with small children. (This was discussed at a table, not with the whole group.)
- **Parking**: there was some interest in car sharing, but most people were concerned as to how they would get car seats for children in and out of the vehicles. Many participants favored one assigned parking place for each unit with an additional, optional fee for a second space. Open to having a secondary parking space in a location further away from the housing complex, as well as tandem parking (for the unit). Significant enthusiasm for receiving a rebate (e.g., free annual bus pass) if the residents didn’t have a car.

**Action Item**: Group decided that workshop feedback was consistent with previous feedback. Instead of hosting another workshop, plan to schedule student engagements with GSA and residents of student family housing currently in Solano to get feedback.

2. **Discussed the 3 Project Delivery Alternatives**
   a. Campus Capital Project
   b. P3 project with a private developer
   c. Tandem Properties project in conjunction with Russell Park

3. **“Percent under city-wide average”**
   a. The group agreed that various terms used to describe family housing could be misleading. Therefore, going forward, the preferred term to describe the housing project will be “x% under the city-wide average.” As in, “housing with rental cost pegged at 15% under the city-wide average.”
   - The 15% mark was indicated by private developers as to how far below market rate they could go on rents and still finance the project; this includes the $6 million for demolition of the current structure that is not included in the project costs
   b. “Affordable housing” could be misleading in that everyone has a different perception of what is affordable
c. “% under market rate” could be misleading because we didn’t do a full analysis of a market; instead, the study represents a sample of 5 market-rate complexes in Davis

**Action Item:** The project will be referred to “family and student housing that is pegged to % under the city-wide average” rather than “affordable housing.”

4. Feasibility study
   a. The analysis was set up around 2-bedroom units, with the ability to change the number of units to determine total project cost, and net present value; the difference between UC and private developer scenarios is also shown. The overall project cost hovers $100 million - $170 million (does not include the demolitions costs being covered by Student Housing)
   b. Some items contributing to the higher cost of UC projects include: higher LEED expectation (UC is expected to maintain gold LEED standard and Student Housing strives for platinum while a private developer only needs to achieve silver); debt service; environmental costs, and prevailing wage expectations.
      • Current scenario shows UC having to payout $117M up front in order to get the financing for the $160M project
   c. There was a discussion about the unit of measurement for the analysis as number of beds is different than the number of occupants and that is different than the number of students. For example, a two-bedroom unit that houses a student who is married to a non-student with a child could be counted as a 2-bedroom unit, 3-person occupancy, or 1 student residence. That same unit could also house a married couple who are both students and that would be counted as a 2-bedroom, 2-person occupancy, or 2-student residence. It was recalled that the last housing proposal included 800 students but approximately 1100-1200 total residents, so clarifying the “count” would be helpful.
   d. In conversation, we can talk about Orchard Park and Solano Park together but we have to remember that they must be financed separately (maintain a 1:1 debt ratio for each project) because the construction will happen in different years. We might be able to consider Russell Park as well, but that is not as far along as the other two projects. In other words, we can’t expect one project to subsidize the others, but we can think about how to use all three properties to achieve the ideal portfolio of housing options for students.
   e. Scenarios to look at in preparation for next meeting
      • 100 2-bedroom units below market rate (BMR) and the rest at market rate
      • 115 beds at 15% BMR, and then figure out the cost of the rest of the beds to make the project zero out
      • Scenarios including 4-bedroom units
Action Item: Rework the analysis worksheet to include units ranging in 1 to 4 beds; test a variety of below market rate to market rate ratios, all hovering around 100 BMR units.

5. Inflation of costs to students/residents over time
   a. Rental cost in the new project will have to be higher than current Solano rates
      - Current Solano rates have been frozen for three years
      - It will be another three years before the new units are offered
      - Can’t keep rents to a cost that is six-years behind current rates
   b. Student concern about increasing rents was not that rents should stay frozen in time, but that there be no sudden or large annual increases that would shock current residents; solutions to this include:
      - Grandfather in current residents if there is a large increase to rent
      - Include in contracts with 3rd party property managers that increases be capped (this is pretty standard and annual increases are usually 2-3% whereas the Davis market recently had a ±10% increase)
   c. To offset concern about the rent, the property managers need to be clear about what utilities are included in the monthly cost
      - At Solano, all utilities except PG&E are covered in the monthly rent
      - During amenitize game, students indicated that they would like campus internet service to be included so that service is seamless and they would have access to research resources from home
   d. It was also clarified that the feasibility model is pegged to 2016 dollars.

Action Item: Include utilities when discussing monthly cost to renters.

6. Additional information gathering
   a. Determine the population of potential renters who have children
      - 32% of current Solano residents are families with children (32% of 276 units = demand for 88 family units), but this doesn’t capture the demand from families who were on the waitlist, but didn’t get a unit
      - Potentially use the waitlist for Solano from June (summer) to determine potential, additional demand for family units
      - Potentially survey students to gauge demand
   b. Survey items
      - Gauge demand for family units (see above), married, singles
      - Ask what percent of total, monthly income students are willing to pay for rent. Recommendation is 25%-30% of income, but students might be willing to go higher because they understand the consequences of their temporarily low income, and the true cost of housing in California/Davis. In other words, our assumption that rents have to be
capped to 25%-30% of student income may be incorrect – and impossible given the project costs

7. Next steps
   a. November 2: GSA meeting (immediately following this meeting)
   b. November 3 or December 1: Solano Community meeting
   c. Revision of feasibility analysis
   d. Completion of “wish list” for Tandem Properties
   e. December 14: PAC meeting
      • Fall quarter ends 12/2 and finals are 12/5-12/9; do we need to reschedule given the student schedule?
   f. February 22, 2017: PAC meeting