

For City Council: Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance

debra taube [REDACTED]

Fri 12/4/2020 7:04 PM

To: Lindsay Lara [REDACTED]

Ms Lara: Please provide to Council

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

I'm writing this as a long time San Rafael resident.

The inclusionary housing ordinance has proven to be one of the most effective tools for securing affordable housing and addressing housing segregation. The inclusionary program has been the source of most of the affordable housing built in San Rafael over the past 10 years.

While I understand that the ordinance might use some fine tuning, I believe that cutting the inclusionary requirement in half, from 20% to 10%, is too much. The 10% option is too low, and additionally the proposed ordinance excludes the provision of units intended for very low-income households, one of the most challenging income levels to house. Please stay with a 15% onsite requirement for all projects with adjustments to the mix of affordable units in mid-rise projects to assure financial feasibility. This level would still be profitable for most projects.

Finally, payment of in-lieu fees should be allowed only for exceptional circumstances. Allowing the project sponsor to pay an in-lieu fee instead of actually creating affordable units continues the pattern of economic exclusion and perpetuates segregation, whether intentional or not.

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on this subject.

Sincerely,

Debra Taube, San Rafael

Inclusionary Zoning-critical for producing affordable housing

saxe.steven@gmail.com [REDACTED]

Fri 12/4/2020 7:08 PM

To: Lindsay Lara [REDACTED]

Ms. Lara: Please provide to Council

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

While adjustments to the inclusionary ordinance might be appropriate, cutting it in half is too much, and dropping very low-income households from its provisions would be a mistake. I believe a 15% onsite requirement for all projects would be more fitting, perhaps with adjustments to the mix of affordable units in mid-rise projects to assure financial feasibility. This level would still be profitable for most projects.

And, I strongly recommend against allowance of an in-lieu fee alternative other than under exceptional and rare circumstances. Marin is one of the most segregated counties in the state, and an in-lieu fee option will perpetuate this problem. Affordable units should be encouraged throughout our neighborhoods, and within each housing development.

Steven Saxe

Inclusionary Zoning-critical for producing affordable housing

Miriam [REDACTED]

Fri 12/4/2020 7:16 PM

To: Lindsay Lara [REDACTED]

Ms. Lara: Please provide to Council

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

[I live or work in San Rafael]

The inclusionary housing ordinance has proven to be one of the most effective tools for securing affordable housing and addressing housing segregation. The inclusionary program has been the source of most of the affordable housing built in San Rafael over the past 10 years.

While I understand that the ordinance might use some fine tuning, I believe that cutting the inclusionary requirement in half, from 20% to 10%, is too much. The 10% option is too low, and additionally the proposed ordinance excludes the provision of units intended for very low-income households, one of the most challenging income levels to house. Please stay with a 15% onsite requirement for all projects with adjustments to the mix of affordable units in mid-rise projects to assure financial feasibility. This level would still be profitable for most projects.

Finally, payment of in-lieu fees should be allowed only for exceptional circumstances. Allowing the project sponsor to pay an in-lieu fee instead of actually creating affordable units continues the pattern of economic exclusion and perpetuates segregation, whether intentional or not.

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on this subject.

Sincerely,

Miriam Weinsrein
Former San Rafael resident
Currently at [REDACTED]
Fairfax

The canyon says "I will hold the sound of your voice until your soul returns to the land."



Responsible Growth in Marin

December 4, 2020

Honorable Mayor Colin, City Council Members and Planning Commissioners
1400 Fifth Avenue, Room 203
San Rafael 94901

Re: Policy Resolution on Design Review Board (DRB) and Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC)

NOTE: PLEASE INCLUDE IN PUBLIC COMMENTS

Dear Mayor Colin, Councilmembers, Planning Commissioners

Representatives from Responsible Growth in Marin have been following the proposed changes to the Design Review Board and creation of the Design Review Advisory Committee (DRAC). This includes the test period currently proposed.

Our group is generally in harmony with the Terra Linda Homeowners' Association October 6th letter with some additional questions/comments:

1. We agree with the benefits of taking major projects to the Planning Commission first to allow public review and debate of critical issues prior to moving the project forward to the Design Review Board. In addition, we are receptive to a process which could allow joint review of a project including both Planning Commission and DRB members to be at the table for appropriate projects if the details can be worked out.
2. We have numerous questions about the composition and schedule of the proposed DRAC (Design Review Advisory Committee) as were discussed in the 11/5/20 DRB meeting:
 - a. Would the DRAC be composed of 2 members or 3 members plus an alternate as suggested by some on the DRB?
 - b. How would the DRAC members be selected and what would be the term length to allow for continuity of project review?
 - c. What is the proposed schedule of DRB meetings vs. DRAC meetings? Will this create more meetings instead of fewer? Is it possible that the scheduling of meetings will actually lengthen the time for project approval?
3. Which projects are sent to the DRAC vs the full DRB? We believe this process should be transparent.
 - a. What is the definition of a small vs large/complex project? For example, in some hillside neighborhoods with narrow roads, a 3-5 unit project would be large for that neighborhood and a 10-unit project would be huge. In other areas, such as downtown, 10-15 units may be considered small.
 - b. Who would determine which committee each project would go to if the criteria cannot be defined by size or scope alone? How would "complexity" be defined?
 - c. Will the projects that go before the DRAC severely limit public comment? Indeed, the DRB members emphasized that many times the neighbors know the quirks and

problems of particular areas better than City staff or the DRB. The DRB finds their input extremely valuable and they appreciate the give and take with the community onboard as part of the “team” in open discussion back and forth. This could be lost in the proposed process with comments only coming prior to the meeting and no conversations during review.

- d. If the zoning administrator is able to review some projects with simple consultation with the DRB Chair, how will these be determined? Will the community lose the transparency of the current system?
4. Will managing the meetings for the DRAC differently than the DRB really streamline work for City staff? What do other cities do to streamline appropriate projects?

In summary, we agree that a trial period to test the streamlined process is important, but the devil is in the details regarding how well this will work for the citizens of San Rafael and the DRB itself. During this time where communications are more difficult, we want to highlight that community input is particularly important even in the pilot process.

Respectfully,
Responsible Growth in Marin
Claire Halenbeck and Byron Kuth



For City Council: Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance

marianne slattery [REDACTED]

Fri 12/4/2020 8:43 PM

To: Lindsay Lara [REDACTED]

Ms Lara: Please provide to Council

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

The inclusionary housing ordinance has proven to be one of the most effective tools for securing affordable housing and addressing housing segregation. The inclusionary program has been the source of most of the affordable housing built in San Rafael over the past 10 years.

While I understand that the ordinance might use some fine tuning, I believe that cutting the inclusionary requirement in half, from 20% to 10%, is too much. The 10% option is too low, and additionally the proposed ordinance excludes the provision of units intended for very low-income households, one of the most challenging income levels to house. Please stay with a 15% onsite requirement for all projects with adjustments to the mix of affordable units in mid-rise projects to assure financial feasibility. This level would still be profitable for most projects.

Finally, payment of in-lieu fees should be allowed only for exceptional circumstances. Allowing the project sponsor to pay an in-lieu fee instead of actually creating affordable units continues the pattern of economic exclusion and perpetuates segregation, whether intentional or not.

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on this subject.

Sincerely,

Marianne Slattery
Fairfax California

Marianne Slattery
[REDACTED]

For City Council: Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance Attn: Lara Lindsay

Ms Angela Gott [REDACTED]

Sat 12/5/2020 3:18 AM

To: Lindsay Lara [REDACTED]

December 5, 2020

Dear Ms. Lindsay,

There is a huge need for housing to be built for the boomer generation, particularly women born 1946 to 1964. Women of the boomer generation began working when minimum wage was \$1.55/hour. Women of the boomer generation have always been last hired, first fired and discriminated against for advancement and promotions too. This generation came of age in the early 70s when SSA (Social Security Administration) changed the rules of eligibility with regard to divorce and created a 10 year "bonafide marriage rule" only this did not come to the awareness of Family Ct. Judges or lawyers who did divorces, for decades, so boomer generation women ended marriages at 7 or 8 years and did not realize that getting a legal separation to ensure the marriage stayed valid to "10 years + one day", would then allow these divorced women to qualify for both spousal support and survivor's benefits based on the earnings record of their former spouses. (This in no way affects the Social Security Benefits of either the former spouse or any subsequent spouses married to the former spouse either.)

Since back then marriages were with male spouses, and male spouses on average were paid at least 25% more than their female counterparts, when it comes to Social Security benefit monthly amounts now, boomer generation women receive significantly lower benefits each month based on their own lifetime earnings histories. Also boomer generation women tended to be in and out of the labor force over their lives and Social Security benefits are based on 35 years of working so boomer generation women have zero years which drag down the benefit amounts too. All this has had the effect that women of the boomer generation years experience much higher rates of poverty in their senior years. They fall into homelessness due to the rising rents. They did not tend to work in industries which paid pensions and they did not tend to work in jobs which had retirement benefits programs either. So they wind up with just social security to live on and it just is not enough money. Many of the homeless women did not wind up homeless until after age 55.

Older women who lose their jobs due to economic recessions are the last to be hired when there is a recovery and they experience so much job discrimination in their older years. No one will hire them and no one wants to rent to them either. When an older couple pools their checks and can barely cover housing, food, etc. this works until one of them dies leaving the other with just the one check. When the couple has not married, and the survivor is the boomer generation woman, not only has she lost her protector and companion but she loses her ability to keep her living situation too. This is why so many women and their pets wind up living in their cars in old age.

So it has never been more important and more critical to build senior & disabled housing opportunities for our seniors. Most men of the boomer generation are Veterans because they were drafted and so the VA housing villages house them and those who stayed in get access to VA hospitals too. Some of them get VA benefits in

addition to social security. Boomer generation women just have nothing going for them at all and so it is critical to maintain the inclusionary zoning ordinance to keep it at 20%. Please do not make boomer generation women's lives harder.

I was born in 1951. I even earned a college degree. Because I never married and never had children, I ran into discrimination in hiring because prospective employers told me I was a hiring risk. Back then they could say anything to women seeking jobs. I was repeatedly told "I had nothing to tie me down without a husband and kids." I was not given full time hours with benefits so I worked multiple jobs as a way of earning enough to survive but barely. I was 52 before I ever got hired in 2003 FT Status for \$7.50/hour, guaranteed 32 hours a week, but finally got healthcare benefits 90 days later at age 53. I had planned to work for this company the rest of my life but in 2011 at age 60 the company went bankrupt. I was only up to \$10.23/hour after 8 years and I lost my healthcare until the ACA began January 1, 2014 and I got on Expanded Medicaid (Medi-Cal) at age 63.

At age 62 all the waitlists for Senior Housing in Marin were closed and they had been closed since 2008. I managed to get on the list by getting in line at 5 AM in February 2014 when 3,000 seniors jumped on the list in a single week and it closed again. It took me 3 years before I found steady work again and it was set at \$12/hour in 2014. I am still earning that now too. No raises, at will, part time, as I approach 70. But I managed to get a precious spot in public housing and now I have a forever home. I am so lucky. I am just extremely fortunate. But so many women in Marin do not have this because there is just not enough senior & disabled housing being built for the extremely low income (under \$29,000 a year) category. All I earned my entire life was about \$22,000 a year. Women need affordable housing opportunities to be built for them. Please do the right thing and protect the boomer generation women from becoming homeless. Thank you.

Angela Gott


San Rafael, CA 94903

Inclusionary Zoning-critical for producing affordable housing

Stacey Laumann [REDACTED]

Sat 12/5/2020 6:29 PM

To: Lindsay Lara [REDACTED]

Ms. Lara: Please provide to Council

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

I am a 15-year resident of San Rafael, member of the San Rafael Park and Rec Commission. I also work in the field of community development and housing.

I understand that the inclusionary ordinance, a key tool for delivering housing choice in San Rafael, needs some fine tuning. I believe that cutting the inclusionary requirement in half, from 20% to 10%, is too much. The 10% option is too low, and additionally the proposed ordinance excludes the provision of units intended for very low-income households, one of the most challenging income levels to house. Please stay with a **15% units for lower income households onsite** requirement for all projects with adjustments to the mix of affordable units in mid-rise projects to assure financial feasibility. This level would still be profitable for most projects.

Finally, payment of in-lieu fees should be allowed only for exceptional circumstances. **Allowing the project sponsor to pay an in-lieu fee instead of actually creating affordable units continues the pattern of economic exclusion and perpetuates segregation**, whether intentional or not.

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on this subject.

Sincerely,
Stacey Laumann
San Rafael resident