Regular Council Meeting

February 26, 2026

FRESNO CITY COUNCIL

City of FRESNO

RECEIVED
2026 FEB 25 A 11:59
CITY OF FRESNO
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

Public Comment Packet

ITEM(S)

2-N (ID 26-182)

Actions pertaining to Uptown L.P. for the Uptown Apartments rental housing development located at 1510 Van Ness Avenue in Downtown Fresno (Council District 3)

[TITLE TRUNCATED FOR SUPPLEMENTAL PACKET COVER PAGE]

Contents of Supplement: Public Comment Received

Supplemental Information:

Any agenda related public documents received and distributed to a majority of the City Council after the Agenda Packet is printed are included in Supplemental Packets. Supplemental Packets are produced as needed. The Supplemental Packet is available for public inspection in the City Clerk's Office, 2600 Fresno Street, during normal business hours (main location pursuant to the Brown Act, G.C. 54957.5(2). In addition, Supplemental Packets are available for public review at the City Council meeting in the City Council Chambers, 2600 Fresno Street. Supplemental Packets are also available on-line on the City Clerk's website.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA):

The meeting room is accessible to the physically disabled, and the services of a translator can be made available. Requests for additional accommodations for the disabled, sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or translators should be made one week prior to the meeting. Please call City Clerk's Office at 621-7650. Please keep the doorways, aisles and wheelchair seating areas open and accessible. If you need assistance with seating because of a disability, please see Security.

From: [redacted]
To:

Subject: E-Comment ID-26-181 & 26-182 / Request for written clarification on agenda items 26-181 and 26-182
Date: Monday, February 23, 2026 9:28:34 AM

External Email: Use caution with links and attachments

Item #26-181, which proposes the use of $8 million from the City's Revolving Loan Fund and an additional $3 million in city funds for the housing development proposed by Park Partners LLC on Fulton Street.

I have several serious concerns and questions that I would like answered on the record.

First, I would like clarification regarding where these "city funds" originate. Are these funds derived from public sources such as taxpayer revenue, state housing allocations, federal programs, redevelopment funds, or other public financing streams? If public funding is being used, why does this project contain no units for extremely low-income residents, particularly when Fresno's most severe housing shortage is at the lowest income levels?

According to the resolution, the project proposes approximately 160 multifamily units, including:

- 32 units at 80% AMI
- 32 units at 50% AMI
- 96 market-rate units

This means the majority of the project is market rate.

I want to be very clear: Fresno does not currently have a shortage of market-rate housing. The housing crisis in our community is among residents earning very low, extremely low, and fixed incomes, including seniors, disabled individuals, and people experiencing homelessness.

So my question to the Council is: How does subsidizing a majority market-rate development meaningfully address Fresno's housing crisis?

The resolution states that the City issued a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFO) on February 13, 2026 for Downtown and Chinatown development. However, when reviewing the City of Fresno bidding portal, I found:

- A NOFO issued August 29, 2025, closed December 31, 2025, with multiple bidders but no selections made.
- A second posting with the same description reopened February 13, 2026, currently still open with approximately 45–50 days remaining, with a due date of April 14, 2026.

If the NOFO is still open, I would like clarification on the following:

1. How was Park Partners LLC selected if the bidding window has not yet closed?
2. What is the official bid or proposal number tied to this resolution?
3. Where can the public view Park Partners LLC's application or proposal?
4. Why does the City website show only one bidder at this time?
5. Is the City pre-selecting developers before the NOFO process has concluded?

Transparency in public funding decisions is critical.

The City states the project will receive up to $8 million from the Revolving Loan Fund as gap financing.

However, the NOFO documentation states that:

- Sources may include up to $20 million in the Revolving Loan Fund.
- The maximum loan per project is $8 million.

My questions are:

- Who determines which projects receive these loans?
- What criteria were used to select this development?

- Why is a market-heavy development prioritized for these public funds?

The resolution also references an additional $3 million in city funds, but it does not clearly identify the source.

I would like clarification on:

- Which specific fund this money is coming from.
- Whether these are local taxpayer dollars.
- Whether this funding requires any public benefit or affordability requirements.

Another concern is the 55-year loan term. What is the justification for extending public financing for more than half a century for a project that is primarily market rate? Most of the individuals approving this today will not be in office when that loan matures.

The public deserves to understand:

- What safeguards exist to ensure accountability.
- What happens if affordability requirements are not maintained.

The project also appears to involve tax-exempt bond financing. Typically, these bonds are associated with affordable housing development.

So I would like clarification:

- Is this project receiving tax-exempt bonds?
- If so, what affordability requirements are attached?
- Is it permissible for a majority market-rate project to receive those benefits?

This project is located on Fulton Street, within blocks of major service providers including

Fresno Rescue Mission and Poverello House.

Thousands of individuals access services in this area every year, and many people experiencing homelessness have lived in this community for years. If public financing is being used, the City should strongly consider requiring deep affordability, including units at 30% AMI or below, to directly address homelessness. I would urge the Council to consider setting aside at least 20% of the units for extremely low-income residents if this project is going to benefit from public investment. Public funds should prioritize the people experiencing the greatest housing instability. If Fresno is serious about addressing homelessness and housing insecurity, developments receiving public assistance must reflect that commitment. I respectfully request full clarification on the questions listed above before moving forward with approval of this item.

I would also like clarification regarding **Item #26-182**, which appears to allocate another $8 million from the Revolving Loan Funds for a separate downtown development (Van Ness & Stanislaus) . This project reported a 9 million dollar gap, Where is the clarification on the 1 million needed to cover the full $9 million grant? Based on the information provided, this project appears to be primarily or entirely above retail, with no clearly stated affordable housing units, not even at 80% AMI. This raises several concerns regarding how public financing is being used to address Fresno's housing needs.

First, I would like confirmation of the funding source. The City previously indicated that approximately $20 million is available within the Revolving Loan Fund for these types of projects. If Item **#26-181** and Item **#26-182** are both receiving **$8 million each**, that totals **$16 million**, leaving approximately **$4 million remaining**.

However, **Item #26-181** also references an additional **$3 million in City funds**, and it is unclear whether that money is also coming from the same Recovery or Revolving Loan Fund.

So I would appreciate clarification on the following:

- Are both projects drawing from the same $20 million funding pool?
- If so, does that mean $16 million is being committed through these two approvals?
- Is the additional $3 million also coming from these funds, and if not, what specific fund is it coming from?

• If these allocations are approved, how much will remain in the Revolving Loan Fund, and what is that remaining funding intended to support?

Transparency around public funding is important so the community understands how these resources are being used. I am also concerned about the loan terms associated with **Item #26-182**. The developer appears to have up to 60 months to repay the loan, which is longer than what is typically seen for financing tied to projects that do not include affordability requirements.

This leads to several additional questions:

• Why is such an extended repayment timeline being offered for a development that does not appear to provide affordable housing?
• What public benefit justifies these loan terms?

Finally, I would like clarification regarding the CEQA exemption being referenced. My understanding is that environmental streamlining or exemptions are often tied to housing policies intended to encourage affordable or workforce housing. However, this project appears to be above market-rate housing with no affordability component.

So I would like the City to explain:

• Which specific exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act is being used for this project?
• How does a development with no affordable housing qualify for that exemption?
• Has the City conducted any environmental review, or is it relying entirely on a categorical exemption?

I am concerned that the current projects seeking access to these funds are primarily market-rate or above-market developments concentrated in the downtown area. At a time when Fresno continues to experience one of the most visible homelessness crises in California, public financing tools should prioritize the residents most affected by the housing shortage.

Without clear affordability requirements, this program risks subsidizing development that does not serve:

- extremely low-income residents

- seniors on fixed incomes
- families facing eviction
- individuals exiting homelessness.

Many cities structure revolving housing funds to prioritize deeply affordable and supportive housing, often partnering with nonprofit developers and service providers. Fresno has an opportunity to do the same.

If this $100 million investment is truly meant to address the housing crisis, I urge the City to consider:

• affordability requirements tied to Area Median Income
• units dedicated to people exiting homelessness
• access for nonprofit housing developers
• transparency around which projects receive loans.

Public funds should deliver public benefits. Right now, Fresno residents deserve assurance that these resources will help address homelessness and not simply accelerate market-rate development.

For the record, I am requesting a written response from the City regarding the funding sources, bidding process, loan terms, and CEQA exemption connected to Items 26-181 and 26-182 so the public can clearly understand how these decisions are being made.

Thank you,

Dez Martinez
CEO/ WANI
[redacted]