1. Affordability
   a. Affordability is defined in comparison to rental cost for units around Davis; not in relations to income earned by student/potential renters.

2. Communication
   a. The PAC made extraordinary effort to make meetings open to the public, to engage students and post regular updates of the project online.
   b. It is important to note these efforts in the final recommendation as one of the charges of the committee was to foster an inclusive process.
   c. It is important that PAC members point to (updated) online resources when fielding questions so we don’t appear to contradict each other because we all have different memory of different outreach activities (i.e., there have been so many that no one can remember everything).

3. Project Options
   a. Campus capital project
      • To keep the project at the equity obligation (e.g., a debt ratio of 1:1), the initial outlay to start the project was $70M, which is much more than the campus can do. While this is the preference of many involved with the project, it is not financially feasible.
      • This option has been taken off the table.
   b. Private developer
      • Details: no equity by campus to get the project started
      • Facility would open for occupancy in fall 2020
      • Three levels of “affordability”
      • This option is viable, but unappealing to constituents
   c. Hybrid P3 (Orchard/Russell development) with Tandem
      • In current analysis, this looks like the best option for affordability
      • Would add 120 units to existing stock with 80 units being “super-affordable”
      • Tandem has been given the current rental rates for Solano as targets for affordability and is tasked with creating a feasibility study/proposal. To meet these goals, Tandem has a number of strategies to lower building costs (e.g., standardizing the buildings). In these parameters.
The university will charge minimal “ground rent” to reduce expenses that might be transferred to rents (the current Russell Park has no ground rent, just annual fee to cover emergency services)

Project has four levels of affordability

4. Russell Park/Solano Park Redevelopment Concept
   a. In Russell Park, create two bike paths that run from housing to campus; these paths create a bounded space around the current daycare building and would create a greenbelt area centered between the two complexes to create one, large community.
   b. Viewing the properties as one large stock of housing makes for a good chance to hit affordability goals by including many cost points; of the three project options, this one delivers the:
      • Most units on site
      • Most diversity of rates on site
      • Lowest rates on site
      • Quickest way to get projects completed
   c. In initial communication with students, they were excited about this option because of previous, positive experience with Tandem as property managers and the fact that this option brings the hope that the construction can move more quickly
      • Tandem has established a good relationship with the campus and students: it is a local company, they have demonstrated success at other properties, and students had good experiences with Tandem as the property manager.

5. Next Steps
   a. At January meeting, thoroughly review the proposal from Tandem
   b. Review communication and online information so that those who are interested in the recommendation of the committee (and eventual final decision of the Chancellor) can easily follow the work and decision making process of the PAC
      • Update Graduate Studies webpage and email announcements
      • Specific messages to Solano Park residents (articles in “park messengers”)
      • FAQs: Where does the money form rent go? Why doesn’t the campus building control the properties? Why Tandem? Why not renovate Russell Park now? What LEED certification will the project have? Why does the project cost so much? Why not put in more units?
      • Committee activities
      • No announcement of incremental decisions or recommendations by the PAC; wait until we are able to clearly explain evaluation of each options and why one was selected and the other two were eliminated
   c. Give GSA an update at the January 11 meeting.
   d. Committee makes a recommendation to the Chancellor (the formal “senders” are the co-chairs VP-UGE, VP-GE) by the end of February.

Meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.