

CITY OF CALISTOGA
HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
November 15, 2021 via Zoom at 10:00 a.m.

1. ROLL CALL

Committee members present virtually: Laurel Gourd, Lana Richardson, Laurel Rios, David Shaw, Cathy Schwamberger. Staff members present: Samantha Thomas, Brad Kilger.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

There were no public comments received.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

Staff member Samantha Thomas noted that the meeting minutes from October 18, 2021, were not complete and would be provided as part of the agenda at December's meeting. The meeting minutes from September 20, 2021, were approved unanimously.

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. Update and Discussion on Housing Element Project/Potential Sites

Sung Kwon at M-Group provided a presentation on potential site selections regarding the Housing Element Project. Mr. Kwon explained that between the 5th cycle and 6th cycle RHNA, the total number of units required have increased from 27 units to 119, in addition to a 15 to 30% buffer. The city can achieve this requirement through RHNA credits, such as pipeline projects and ADU's. With RHNA credits considered, the city's total net new units needed is 31. The purpose of the workshop was to discuss the sites and give M-Group some priorities in terms of which sites the city should utilize.

Committee member Schwamberger asked about the ownership of the sites. Mr. Kwon indicated that the sites are all individually owned and were identified in the City's 5th cycle, extending the sites as opportunity sites for the 6th cycle. Chair Gourd discussed the potential opportunity sites in detail. Committee member Richardson asked why the city wouldn't want to include city owned properties. Mr. Kwon explained that City Council gave direction to focus on the reuse sites. He indicated that new sites are considered beyond the reuse sites, then there's a greater amount of environmental review that would be required, and that's additional cost to the city and timelines.

Chair Gourd asked what type of housing the city would propose on each lot to meet the required housing numbers under the 6th cycle. Mr. Kwon indicated 20 units per acre is being utilized, which is the density required to build affordable housing as determined by HCD. Another requirement from HCD is that on each lot, there would need to be at least 16 units. Mr. Kwon clarified that to meet the 31 units needed, only 2 to 3 sites may need to be developed. Chair Gourd asked to open discussion up to the public in which staff member Thomas indicated no public comments have been received and no members of the public are present. Chair Gourd recommended holding this discuss during a time the public may be able to participate and promote this item further. Staff member Thomas recommended continuing this discission for the next meeting in December and letting the public

know they can comment via email if they aren't able to attend the meeting. Staff member Brad Kilger recommended holding the meeting either late afternoon or early evening to encourage input and participation, though the city is short-staffed. Staff member Kilger asked that staff meet internally and get back to HAC members regarding the possibility of holding special meetings in the evening just for these items.

Chair Gourd agreed and indicated that if this information can be shared with the public again, providing a little more context might help people formulate more informed public comments. Committee member Schwamberger recommended sending this meeting's recording to the Calistoga Tribune along with a blurb welcoming the community's input regarding the potential site options. Staff member Thomas indicated staff could include it again in the local newspaper. Chair Gourd indicated she would like to look into outreach to the property owners of these sites to confirm whether they would be interested in developing their property for housing. Committee member Schwamberger believes Site G and F on the handout would provide good opportunities for affordable housing. Committee member Shaw noted a developer is needed and recommended possibly reaching out to Burbank Housing. Staff member Thomas indicated that next steps would entail staff meeting internally to develop a course of action for outreach.

B. Goals Setting for 2022

Chair Gourd presented the discussion for HAC's 2022 goal setting. Committee member Schwamberger indicated the HAC should continue to learn more about housing. She recommended that the HAC could work on surfacing information from the public – obtaining more public input and provide education around housing. Committee member Rios emphasized that with the opening of the new resorts, it's becoming more apparent there is not enough housing in Napa Valley. She explained that the HAC should try to get community input but understand that usually those who are the most vocal don't usually represent the majority. Committee member Richardson recommended the HAC review the goals and objectives in the City's General Plan related to the housing element. Chair Gourd mentioned the City Council's goals, objectives, and priority projects related to housing as well for the HAC to review.

Chair Gourd asked, of the sites available, do any of them lend to the land trust model, so that people could have an affordable option in owning property. She recommended having some presentations to the HAC from an affordable housing developer or mission driven developer and ask what they would need to partner with our community. Staff member Kilger asked that the HAC work with staff prior to inviting developers and ensure they know who they are inviting. Chair Gourd recommended coming back in December to strategize achieving some of the goals discussed. The HAC agreed to discuss further at December's meeting.

C. Continued Discussion of Shared Readings

No readings were discussed.

5. COMMITTEE MEMBERS' IDEAS & REQUESTS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION

The HAC and staff member Thomas confirmed the meeting schedule for 2022 would be decided on during December's meeting. The possibility of meeting in person next year, when able was also discussed.

6. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:26 a.m.