

# Strawberry Design Review Board (SDRB)

## Approved Meeting Notes

Public Meeting – Monday, February 7, 2022

**Meeting location:** Via Zoom.

**Call to order:** 7:35 p.m. by Julie Brown (filling in for chair Joe Sherer)

**Board members present:** Julie Brown, Chad Sparks and Matt Williams.

**Board members absent:** Penna Omega and Joe Sherer.

**Other attendees:** Joan Chaplick, Fran and Bruce Corcoran, Penny Crow, Darla Farr, Randy Greenberg, Amaya Greenspan, Richard Harris, Marcus P. Holzer, Mark Inbody, Emily Lavin, Kevin McAuley, Philip Norris, Kevin McCauley, Stephanie Moulton-Peters, Steve Raizes, Alex Raymond, Gail Rodich, Jose Rodriguez, Barbara Rowe, Drew Sanchez, Dane Solomon, Leelee Thomas, Rona Weintraub, Mike Yao, and Katherine Lehmann (notetaker). Plus: Bill, Justin, and Karen.

**Correspondence and announcements:** None

**Review of Past Meeting Minutes from 1-17-22.**

- Minutes from the January 17 meeting were unanimously approved 3-0.

**Any Comments from the Public for Non-agenda Items**

- No comments

### Agenda Item #1:

**Housing Element Update by County Staff:**

- Aileen Tanielian, Leelee Thomas, and Gillian Zeigler

**Presentation by: Joan Chaplick** - Principal at MIG, and **Joe Rodriguez** - Senior Planner and Housing and Land Use Planner, MIG <https://www.migcom.com/>.

- See **Appendix A** for a description of each slide in the PowerPoint presentation of the Community “Roadshow.”
- See **Appendix B** for Zoom CHAT during the meeting.

### BOARD DISCUSSION:

- **Housing Unit Numbers:**

- **Matt:** An increase of housing units by 19 times is a bit bizarre. **Chad:** Is your housing plan based on 3,519 or on 6,000 units? **Jose:** Each of the sites has different numbers based on scenarios. Each of the scenarios adds up to 3,519 units. **Julie:** Potentially 6,000 units, but only 3,500 are in the plan? The public should know better how you chose these units and how to recommend potential units for development; is this what you are trying to get from us?

- **Balancing Act:**

Jose: The Balancing Act is to provide comments. It does not show all the units. Julie: When I go onto a site, I want to know what are the pros and cons. If that information is not there, how can public make an educated contribution? Leelee: Balancing Act is a tool for looking at types of trade-offs.

- **Types of Housing Unit Sites:**
  - **Leelee:** Two types of sites are not included in the Balancing Act. If a site already has an approval, then it is listed but not included in the Balancing Act. Other sites are those considered by the State as Credit sites, i.e., those with approved entitlements, in the pipeline, or active applications, etc. Those sites are also not in Balancing Act.
  - A map shows every single site with features where you can comment on them. You can also add a site, and see where other people have made a recommendation.
  - **Matt:** It is the same sites, whichever scenario I am looking at. **Jose:** The majority are the same sites. Some of the housing numbers are adjusted based on scenarios.
- **Information and Feedback:**
  - **Jose:** We have a lot of information, but not all of that is there on the sites. **Julie:** Are you providing the wider audience with the information they need to make their recommendations? For instance, why a site is there and why it was chosen for that use? **Jose:** There will be a lot of information to help provide comments on the sites. **Leelee:** We are looking for local knowledge and input from the public. We need to be aware of traffic patterns, pros and cons of a local housing site, local floods, etc.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

**Bruce and Fran Corcoran:** Seminary is not listed. That can provide an additional 136 homes plus 536 (672) housing units planned for Strawberry. That is 20% of the unincorporated housing needs. How is it possible to have that many homes in tiny Strawberry?

**Jose:** We need to find more sites. We will use the housing numbers in the Seminary sites. We are looking for sites that are potential for housing. There may be zero housing in Strawberry or other communities.

**Julie:** Bruce is talking about equitable distribution. Where does that come in? People can comment on equitable distribution in Balancing Act?

**Rick Harris:** For Leelee: RHNA has imposed requirements. MIG is looking at a subset of that number. I want to see a map that has MIG alternatives in it but also Credit Housing.

**Leelee:** We have that information on our website. Gillian will put a link in the chat. At this point, we have more sites than we need and they are all shown.

**Rona Weintraub:** I attended the Tamalpais Design Review Board (TDRB) meeting [on February 2]. There were 4 places in Strawberry. Are there more than 4 in Strawberry now?

**Jose:** R11: We think part of the shopping area could be added to some housing. Some sites have multiple lots with more than one address.

**Mark Inbody:** R2 and R7: One of the sites has three farms with birds and wildlife on them. This area is important to us. Policies are not taking into account the people who live in these areas. My question is: What boots on the ground do we have for this? Have you actually been to these places? There is no way that 54 housing units should be put on that spot.

**Justin:** Lovely area just mentioned by Mark. Two questions: There are 6,000 plus sites, and 3,500 appear in the Balancing Act tool. Are there other sites for us to see? Where are those in the process? Were they identified, but eliminated, for some reason? Second question: The process itself is incentivized to say zero in our area and put them somewhere else.

**Julie:** You are empowering people to add and remove units, but not to look at the hidden sites. That's bothering people. It might be a flaw in the plan.

**Leelee:** The goal is to identify where we should have housing. It is not just to say no. What are the trade-offs on where to locate the housing? We have a number of tools for feedback from the public, including the Map, where you can show where housing should go. Whenever we add sites, we include comments on every single site. We are collecting comments, emails.

**Julie:** Why did you remove 3000 units from the balancing act?

**Leelee:** The program wouldn't allow all of the sites. It was designed for small communities, i.e., Fairfax with 8 sites. So, we have chosen the difficult sites, some in most of the communities.

**Julie:** You could have Balancing Act A and B, each with 3000 sites. You could get input on all the sites.

**Leelee:** We do a lot of work before and then present you with a much shorter list. We are showing the whole list, trying to be as transparent as we can.

**Julie:** I want to comment on just Strawberry. Is there a place where we get to review every opportunity in Strawberry?

**Jose:** Map shows all the credit sites. There is only one in Strawberry.

**Kay Harris:** This is a huge undertaking. It is a crazy undertaking and why the whole county has not stood up against it, I don't know?

**Michel Gallagher:** What is the total number of the credit sites? How many do you already have?

**Jose** will put that in the chat. (473 units). It does include the Seminary. The numbers are the net increase. Gillian will put the link on the Chat.

**Leelee:** A number of counties did appeal. They exhausted the appeal process, but we were not successful.

## **BOARD DISCUSSION:**

**Julie:** No more questions. Thanks to the community for all their questions.

**Leelee:** Thank you for time, and please look at our website.

## **Agenda Item #2:**

### **Continued Discussion and Review of Strawberry Village Use Permit (P3379):**

Strawberry Village Use Permit  
50 Belvedere Drive, Mill Valley  
Assessor's Parcel: 043-322-03

**Project ID:** P3379

**Planner:** Megan Alton

## **PROJECT SUMMARY**

The applicant is requesting Use Permit approval to allow for a veterinary practice at Strawberry Village in Mill Valley. The facility would operate an office, including all uses incidental to a veterinary general practice, with exam rooms, a surgery suite, and a canine and feline dental suite. The facility would include 7 veterinarians with a capacity of 10 patients by appointment. The hours of operation would be 7:00 am to 7:00 p.m., 7 days a week.

Use Permit approval is required because the project is a conditionally permitted use in the RMPC Zoning District.

**Zoning:** RMPC

**Countywide Plan Designation:** GC

**Community Plan (if applicable):** Strawberry Plan Area

For more information on this application, please visit the Planning Division's website at:

<http://www.marincounty.org/depts/cd/divisions/planning/projects>. Project plans and other documents related to the application are available on the project's webpage, where you can subscribe to receive email notifications and updates.

**Alex:** This is our second visit to the Board to address their concerns.

- **Parking:** Parking calculations include the reciprocal easement agreement in place at this address. REA Additional 23 parking stalls in the main Strawberry Village lot, across the street. From 50 Bellevue Drive.
- **Sidewalk and Crosswalk** The safest and common rout to our place. Those parking across the street, shown on the drawing.
- **Rest room for animals:** Dedicated area for the animals a Potty yard at the back of the lot.
- **Lighting:** Existing street lighting to be kept. Spotlight to be replaced.
- **Fire Hydrant:** We prefer the rear for the Potty yard. There is another fire department connection that was not previously called out on our original set.

**BOARD COMMENTS:**

- **Crosswalk: Matt:** Our concern that people would cross where there is no crossing. **Julie:** There is no cross walk in the most desirable convenient location. **Alex:** County deemed our study sufficient. The location of the crosswalk was not discussed. Providing a safe means of getting there, definitely noted.
- **Potty Yard: Julie:** Is the potty yard at the back of the area visible? **Matt:** There is no door at the back. You have to go around? **Alex:** Staff would be comfortable using that back space when animals are in their care. Noted to add a door in the back. **Julie:** What is happening at the patio for dogs relieving themselves? **Alex:** The back yard patch would be easily accessible. Certainly worth consideration.
- **Lighting: Julie:** Have you checked the light pollution? **Alex:** We will provide light fixture schedules & specifications, but we need to address the light pollution. I encourage you to look at streetlights, whether they are appropriate.
- **Signage:** Is the signage lit in any meaningful way? No details of sign. **Alex:** It will be illuminated by another light. We will make a separate application for signage. **Julie:** It is easier for us to see it one time with all the information collected. Even if they are separate permits, you can submit them to us at the same time. Light pollution is a concern of ours.
- **Conditional Approval: Julie:** We can offer a conditional approval, based on resubmittal of exterior light plan, along with a signage application. **Alex:** Can we not move our application forward before we submit that signage application? **Matt:** We would give you conditional use approval.

**Motion:** To approve the conditional use permit, with the following conditions:

1. That exterior lighting be submitted with the exterior signage for review and approval by the board (SDRB).
2. And we strongly suggest that the Strawberry Village and Dept. of Public Works (DPW) have a meeting to provide a crosswalk connecting the eastern sidewalk terminus across Belvedere Drive to Strawberry Village.
3. To provide adequate signage and accessibility for a dog potty area and to explore other more obvious locations.

**The motion to recommend conditional use approval passed unanimously, 3-0.**

**Alex:** You want us to present one package, under one application, for exterior lighting and signage.

**Julie:** Yes, one package.

**Agenda Item #3:**

**Continued Discussion and Review of the Franchise McDonald’s Design and Signage Review (P3292):**

McDonald's Restaurant  
600 Redwood Highway  
Mill Valley, CA 94941-3071

**Project ID:** P3292

**Senior Planner:** Immanuel Bereket

**Franchise McDonald's Design Review and Sign Review (P3292):** The applicant requests Design Review and Sign Permit approval to construct a 165 square foot addition to an existing drive-through restaurant (McDonald's) on a developed lot in the Strawberry area of Mill Valley. The 165 square feet of proposed addition would result in a floor area ratio of 13 percent on the 24,330 square foot lot. The proposed addition would reach a maximum height of 18 feet above surrounding grade, and the exterior walls would have the following setbacks: 45 feet from the east side property line, and over 50 feet from all other property lines. The project also proposes Sign Review application as part of a comprehensive change to the exterior of the McDonald's building. The request is to remove and install new signage, including directional signage, wall-mounted signage, reader board/menu signage, to remove one of the signs at the north elevation and add new signage. Planner: Immanuel Bereket.

This is a continuance from the SDRB meeting on October 4, 2021, when the initial version of the plans were reviewed by the SDRB.

**Julie:** This is a sign review and there is no signage listed on the posted drawings the website.

**Mike Yao:**

We are not proposing any new signs on the buildings, in order to keep the existing monument sign, which is already taking up the 50 sq. ft allowed for signage on this project.

Mike then presented the modified plans that were submitted, based on feedback from the previous meeting with the SDRB on October 4:

- **Building modified**, Parapet, with a mansard roof, adding 5 inches to the building height.
- **LED Lights:** In addition to the menu lights, the lights shown on the plans are the only retrofit lights.
- **Signage:** The big McDonald's monument sign is still being kept. There are only a few directional signs, such as Window position signs: "Pay Here," "Pick Up Here." We put these over the windows. Two new signs for the Drive Thru. One is a sign and canopy structure. About 7 sq. ft. It is over the 15 sq.ft. sign allowance and is included for your review. New one is a small canopy sign over the square canopy. 2 sq. feet. Its not illuminated. **Chad:** Total signage is 20 ft in the menu sign and 10 feet in the pre-order sign, 30 feet and 7 feet for gateway, 2 for overhead canopy, plus exit and entrance. Traffic directional signs do not count towards company signs. **Kevin:** We will use regular non-branded company signage.
- **Two current menu boards** are being replaced with a pre-sell board, then 15 feet from this is the main order menu board. The two new signs for the main order menu board are 4x4 feet each, and about 10 square feet, with one single screen, in an aluminum frame. The main menu board is two single 55"-inch screens, or a double 55"-inch screen, with about 20 square feet. Brightness depends on the light around the area. Backside of the panels are blank. Single-sided. Canopy is not illuminated.
- **Entry and Exit directional signs.** Could not be manufactured without the M, so our signage package does not include the directional signs. **Julie:** Are you saying that it is not possible to have exit signs without an illuminated arches sign? **Kevin McAuley:** We can make it like a

standard road sign. **Julie:** Can you make it single-lane exit and right turn only? **Chad Sparks:** With an Entrance sign on the other opening.

- **Storage Building/Yard: Matt:** Is there any sprucing up of the storage building area in back? **Mike:** Staying as it is, but we are painting it the same color as the main building.
- **LED Lights: Julie:** The color temperature is 5000K lights. It should be maximum of 3000K. **Kevin:** We will check on that.
- **Landscaping: Mike:** We are adding a ramp in the front and removing 20 feet of “green wall” landscaping to have that access from the sidewalk to the property. **Julie:** The big green wall will be reduced with light spilling out. **Mike:** There is no lighting on the ramp. **Julie:** Add that to our list of accomplishments!
- **Feedback: Chad:** You took our recommendations and adjusted the design. This new design is much improved and will be a help to the community. Everybody wants that. **Mike:** Thanks for the feedback. It really helped us.

**Motion:** To recommend approval of the new application, to include the 30 sq. ft. of extra signage for the menu board and to please include a fresh coat of paint on the freezer box and the trash grill. With additional traffic signage (Exit Only), to specify the color temperature of canopy lighting with a max 3000K wattage, also to please soften the lighting on the building with a color temperature maximum of 3000K.

**The motion to recommend conditional approval of this application passed unanimously, 3-0.**

**KL:** In Joe’s absence, Julie, please send an email tomorrow to the planners, with a copy to Michelle Levenson and me, with bullet points listing approvals with the conditions. Thank you!

**Communications and Future Agenda Items:** None.

**The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:00 p.m.**

*The Strawberry Design Review Board (SDRB) meets on the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Mondays of every month, at 7:30 PM, to review and make recommendations to the County on projects in unincorporated Strawberry Village. Recommendations are advisory only.*

## **APPENDIX A: COMMUNITY ROAD SHOW POWERPOINT PRESENTATION**

**Joan Chaplick: PowerPoint Presentation:**

- **Slide: Housing Element Update**  
Community Roadshow, January – February 2022
- **Slide : Agenda**
  - Update on the Housing Element: Brief update on the process
  - Process for Selecting Potential Housing Sites: Process for identifying and selecting potential housing sites
  - How to provide input on the sites using Balancing Act: Introduce a digital engagement tool called the Balancing Act. We would like widespread use of this tool across the county to help make the decisions.
  - Balancing Act office hours
  - Closing Comments, & Q&A
- **Slide: Roadshow Goals**

- Inform: the community about the planning process for achieving County housing goals and the Site Selection Process.
- Provide: an opportunity for the participants to share their input on the site selection process.
- Introduce: Balancing Act – a digital tool for providing feedback on sites.
- **Slide: Tonight’s meeting**
  - Receive comments from the DRB and members of the Public.
  - Not seeking decision or formal review.
  - Encourage the use of Balancing Act as a key tool for providing feedback.
- **Slide: What is a Housing Element**
  - Every 8 years every city is required to update their housing element. In the SF Bay Region.
  - They need to be adopted by the end of this year so they can be sent to Housing and Community Development for approval in January 2023.
  - Tonight discuss only Un-incorporated areas of Marin County.
  - Each city will create their own Housing Element and it should include fair share of the regional housing need.
- **Slide: What is the RHNA?**
  - Regional Housing Need Allocation. RHNA.
  - HCD determines RHNA for each Council of Governments
  - For Bay Area is 441,176. Marin County 14,210, and **Unincorporated Areas 3,569 units**
- **Slide: Previous and Current RHNA Cycles**
  - RHNA further broken down by affordability. From Very Low, Low, Moderate and Above Moderate income levels.
  - The current allocation is significantly higher than previous three cycles. This reflects the housing crisis that many are experiencing.
- **Slide: Housing Units by Type in Unincorporated Marin County**
  - Since the last cycle only 237 units added. Majority single-family homes.

**Jose Rodriguez:**

- **Slide: Housing Sites Considerations:** For selecting candidate housing sites:
  - Existing Use of the site. Vacant, Commercial, etc.
  - Realistic Development Potential: How many units can we count on?
  - Site size:
  - Development Density: Current allowable density, acceptable by HCD (Housing and Community Development Department) has very high standards that the property selected can actually accommodate new housing.
- **Slide: Sites Inventory: Assumptions:**
  - Homes distributed by income categories. Density plays an important role in identifying the affordability. Marin County has minimum density requirement for lower income of 30 dwelling units / acre, (State has a law allowing for 20 DU/per acre).
- **Slide: Guiding Principles:** for selection of housing sites approved by the Board last year.
  - Ensure countywide distribution.
  - Racial Equity, historical patterns of segregation
  - Encourage Infill and Redevelopment Opportunities
  - Consider Environmental Hazards: Sea water level rise, Wild fire, etc.
  - Leverage Surplus lands: State owned, School sites,
  - Ensure Robust Public Engagement around all sites.
- **Slide: Site Inventory: Strategies:** for selecting candidate sites

- Vacant residential site: (Factor in constraints, e.g., hazards such as slopes)
- Approved and proposed Projects. Approved but not yet built can be counted towards the total required.
- Accessory Dwelling Units can provide additional housing
- Public Owned Lands, surplus lands,
- Increase densities in residential areas
- Re-zoning commercial sites: large parking areas, mix use
- Religious Institutions: State has reduced parking requirement by 50% for churches to build housing, if they so desire.
- School Sites, excess site areas could be used.
- Affordable Housing Conversion: old motels, Rehabilitation, preservation of existing stock,
- **Slide: Preliminary Assessment:**
  - Geographic review of Marin County Properties (on a Map)
  - Through the lens of different Strategies: Hazards of fire, flood, Steep slopes, etc.
  - EIR will be part of the documents if a site is selected.
  - Note: The County only provides the regulatory environment, it does not build the housing.
- **Slide: Realistic Capacity Assumptions:** How many units can we put on that site? :
  - Vacant Residential Land,
  - Underutilized Residential Land, Building to Land Value Ratio?
  - Underutilized Non-Residential Land.
- **Slide: Candidate Housing sites:**
  - We have identified sites to build over 6000 housing units in the County. (Required 3519).
  - Through this public engagement process review, we want a feedback on what sites the community want to see included, or excluded, in the Housing Element.
- **Slide: Four Scenarios:** based on Guiding Principles:
  - **Ensure countywide distribution.**
  - **Racial Equity, historical patterns of segregation:** Taken out sites where there is higher ratio of lower income units.
  - **Encourage Infill and Redevelopment Opportunities:** concentrates more in the city center areas where there is infrastructure though infill site areas
  - **Consider Environmental Hazards:** Sea water level rise, Wild fire, etc. These sites taken out
  - Leverage Surplus lands: State owned, School sites,
  - Ensure Robust Public Engagement
- **Slide: Balancing Act:**
  - On the Marin County webpage, go to the Housing Element. There are four icons. Choose the Balancing Act icon for the Balancing Act page.
  - We have scenarios that distribute sites based on different scenarios.
- **Slide: Balancing Act page**
  - You can select one of the four scenarios. Whatever Guiding Principle is more important to you: countywide distribution, Infill sites, etc.?
  - Go to the map, choose a site, increase or reduce the number of housing units, and provide comments on the sites and scenarios
  - All sites are not yet on the map.



- We will take the information through the Balancing Act and present it to the Board of Supervisors to help them understand where public interest and comment are on the housing sites.

**Joan Chaplick:**

- **Slide: Opportunity for Input:**

- These are Opportunities for community input. The road show will visit Kentfield, Tamalpais, Lucas Valley, etc. There will be three meetings where Spanish interpretation will be available.
- Community can ask questions during the virtual office hours Marin county staff, about the how the Balancing Act works, and how to maneuver around the interface.

**Appendix B: CHAT During Zoom Meeting on February 7:**

00:19:26 Barbara Rowe: What is MIG?

00:20:05 Leelee Thomas I County of Marin: MIG is a consulting firm helping us with the Housing and Safety Element updates.

00:20:32 Mark Inbody: Does anyone from MIG live in Strawberry?

00:21:00 Barbara Rowe: What does MIG stand for? M...I...G...?

00:21:05 Philip Norris: <https://www.migref.com/> Not sure if this is the same firm, a real estate development firm

00:21:47 Jillian Zeiger | County of Marin: <https://www.migcom.com/>

00:22:07 Philip Norris: <https://www.migcom.com/>

00:22:11 Philip Norris: This is the firm

00:26:24 Mark Inbody: Jose - please let us know how many times you have personally been to Strawberry for your analysis.

00:26:47 Michael Gallagher: Does the “Above Moderate” of 120%+ include market rate housing?

00:28:39 Jillian Zeiger | County of Marin: Yes, typically market rate housing is considered "Above Moderate"

00:30:07 Richard Harris: Bay Area population is projected to increase 11.1% over the next 20 yrs. However, Marin’s population is projected to decline by 2.1% over that same period. Why are we building hosing in light of the projected decline?

00:30:46 Mark Inbody: Where are the environmental concerns?

00:31:26 Mark Inbody: How are environmental concerns not even on this list?

00:32:41 Jillian Zeiger | County of Marin: Richard- the housing units computed by ABAG take into account existing unmet need for housing as well as future need.

00:33:31 Jillian Zeiger | County of Marin: Mark- Environmental concerns are studied in our environmental review process that will commence later this year.

00:34:11 Mark Inbody: Thank you.

00:41:36 Michael Gallagher: Are there government subsidies which help finance the “affordable” units? (And how are the income restrictions enforced over time?)

00:46:03 Leelee Thomas I County of Marin: Michael - the main source of funding for affordable housing are tax credits, there are also Federal, State and local sources of funding. Affordable homes are deed restricted for at least 55 years and monitoring and income certification is required.

00:47:03 Karen: Once you play with the sites and housing numbers, how does it get submitted?

00:47:34 Jose M. Rodriguez | MIG: Great question, you can submit your plan at the very bottom. There is a 'submit button'

00:48:36 Michael Gallagher: How many housing units have been allocated to the old Baptist Seminary site?

00:50:54 Karen: Is Marin City or Marin Gateway one of the sites? Marin Gateway has never been financially successful so hopefully it is on the list to be redeveloped.

00:51:22 Jillian Zeiger | County of Marin: The Marin Gateway shopping center is one of the candidate sites.

00:57:29 Jillian Zeiger | County of Marin: Here is Marin Map:  
<https://www.marinmap.org/Html5Viewer/Index.html?viewer=smmdataviewer>

01:01:37 Michael Gallagher: How many units are "approved / proposed" compared to the 3569 goal for unincorporated Marin?

01:03:50 Jillian Zeiger | County of Marin: Michael- can you clarify what you mean by "approved/proposed"? Thank you.

01:06:42 Michael Gallagher: Developments that are in the pipeline already...

01:06:47 Michael Gallagher: What is that number?

01:06:48 Barbara Rowe: Strawberry is in Southern Marin - more living units in Strawberry will keep cars off the freeway going north during rush hour traffic. I am in support of the Seminary project

01:08:04 Jillian Zeiger | County of Marin: Thanks, Michael. Developments in the pipeline that we are counting toward the Housing Element as a credit site can be viewed here:  
[https://www.marincounty.org/-/media/files/departments/cd/planning/cwp/housing-and-safety-elements/sites/020422-sites-list/candidatehousingsites\\_credit\\_02042022.pdf?la=en](https://www.marincounty.org/-/media/files/departments/cd/planning/cwp/housing-and-safety-elements/sites/020422-sites-list/candidatehousingsites_credit_02042022.pdf?la=en)

01:09:03 Jillian Zeiger | County of Marin: Full sites map (including credit sites like Seminary):  
<https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/0/viewer?mid=1fpxZN5FM9A7ZBYywc1FyYZNkqItdN056&ll=37.89238618312197%2C-122.51250054946502&z=15>

01:24:04 Katherine Lehmann: Kay Harris is next and Michael Gallagher after Kay.

01:27:20 Jillian Zeiger | County of Marin: Jose is in this map that is publicly accessible here:  
Full sites map (including credit sites like Seminary):  
<https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/0/viewer?mid=1fpxZN5FM9A7ZBYywc1FyYZNkqItdN056&ll=37.89238618312197%2C-122.51250054946502&z=15>

01:32:51 Jillian Zeiger | County of Marin: Housing Element as a credit site can be viewed here: [https://www.marincounty.org/-/media/files/departments/cd/planning/cwp/housing-and-safety-elements/sites/020422-sites-list/candidatehousingsites\\_credit\\_02042022.pdf?la=en](https://www.marincounty.org/-/media/files/departments/cd/planning/cwp/housing-and-safety-elements/sites/020422-sites-list/candidatehousingsites_credit_02042022.pdf?la=en)

01:34:48 Jillian Zeiger | County of Marin: if you have questions email [housingelement@marincounty.org](mailto:housingelement@marincounty.org), thank you!

01:35:04 Mark Inbody: Thank you all.

02:13:49 Alex Raymond - PA: Thank you! Have a great evening.